GATEWAY SEMINARY-BAY AREA
3 0008 00010 0401

RLD'S DEBT TO THE BAPTISTS

J.W. PORTER

DATE DUE

DEMCO 13829810

THE WORLD'S DEBT TO THE BAPTISTS

BY

J. W. PORTER, D.D., LL.D.

Editor of the Western Recorder

LOUISVILLE

Baptist Book Concern

BX
6333
P7
B3
c. 2

Copyright, 1914, by
Baptist Book Concern

INTRODUCTION

If any reason were required for the appearance of this volume, it may be found in the fact that it is the only one, known to the author, claiming to give the crowning achievements of a people whose historic deeds have often been wantonly neglected or willfully ignored. Even Baptist historians, through an overweening sense of modesty, have been reluctant to claim that which those unfriendly to their faith have been forced to concede. It is therefore the purpose of this volume to acquaint our people, and others who may wish to know, with the character and extent of the debt that the world owes to the Baptists.

All too long they have allowed their deeds to go unheralded, contenting themselves with a clear conscience, and what others have accorded them. It is a fact that those who have made history have usually been too busy to write of their own deeds, or what God has done through them, and hence the makers of history have not, as a rule, been the

writers of history. We believe, then, that the time has fully come when the Baptist contribution to the welfare of the world should be placed in concrete form, and in easy reach of the reader who would know of the deathless deeds of this persecuted but persevering people.

Be it understood that it is not within the purpose or province of this volume to give a history of the Baptists, either in the first or twentieth century, but rather to tell of their gifts to the well-being of mankind. This, we believe, is due not only to those who can no longer speak for themselves, and to the multitudes who now share the many blessings bought by Baptist brains and blood, but, above all, to Him who hath redeemed us with his own precious blood, and preserved and perpetuated us through the ages as a peculiar people, with a heroic past, and, we trust, a glorious future.

CONTENTS

PAGE

I.

The World's Debt to the Baptists..... 7

II.

Religious Liberty..... 11

III.

A Regenerate Church-membership..... 99

IV.

The Democracy of New Testament Institutions 105

V.

Restoring the Commission..... 109

VI.

Modern Sunday-schools 119

VII.

Bible Translation and Circulation.... 133

VIII.

Baptist Perpetuity..... 140

I.

THE WORLD'S DEBT TO THE BAPTISTS

Few things are more gratifying than the knowledge of the fact that those of our own flesh or faith have done something worth while in the world, and have, therefore, justified their mission among the children of men. The man, or Baptist, who cares nothing for his history, is usually the one who believes his history uneventful or unfortunate.

Of all people, Baptists have probably suffered more from the world's lack of knowledge of their history. All too long have Baptists been indifferent in acquiring a knowledge of their history, and affording to others an opportunity, at least, of knowing what they have done for the enlightenment and betterment of mankind. No true Baptist can be content to hide the light of his people's history under a bushel, or bury the deeds of Baptists with their bodies. Whatever the Baptist contribution to history,

justice to man and gratitude to God demand that this contribution be made manifest.

The world is not as slow as it may seem, in acknowledging and discharging obligations to its benefactors, when those obligations are properly presented to its attention. To do this, as far as our limited space will allow, is the purpose of these pages.

We mention, as the first item in the list of the world's indebtedness to Baptists, the right of every individual to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience.

This age-long contention of Baptists for liberty of conscience is predicated upon the teaching of both Testaments, that the soul is only responsible to its Creator; that neither civil court nor ecclesiastical council can enter the realm of the soul or dictate in matters of conscience.

It may be well to state, just here, what Baptists believe to be the meaning of the words "religious liberty." They do not believe, as many seem to teach, that religious "toleration" and liberty are identical in meaning. Toleration accords to dissenters the right to support their own churches, and at the same time compels them to support the

state church. According to the *Baptist* conception of religious liberty, the individual has a perfect legal right to worship, or not worship, as he may see fit, and that no nation has a right to establish a "state church," or to make or enforce a law compelling any one to support any ecclesiastical institution.

All the nations worthy of note now offer religious toleration, but many of them still withhold the God-given and inalienable right of religious liberty. Baptists do not ask religious toleration either for themselves or others, but absolute religious liberty for all mankind. This has been their contention through the centuries, and will be to the end of time. We may thank God and take courage that our labor of love has not been in vain in the Lord. Baptists have issued the proclamation of religious emancipation to the universe, and as a result the shackles of ecclesiastical slavery have fallen from millions of hearts and hands.

This blessed privilege of religious liberty, which is now well-nigh universally recognized and generally enjoyed, is assumed by many as a mere matter of course. Little indeed do those who now enjoy this priceless privilege realize what it has cost in tears

and blood. The question, however, is not so much the worth of this inestimable gift, but rather to whom is due the credit for this, probably the greatest of all earthly blessings. We confidently affirm that Baptists have been the benefactors who have made this mighty contribution to the world's welfare. In proof of this contention we offer, in these pages, testimony which it is believed will be deemed quite sufficient to establish the claim.

II.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

It has been said that there are two things in the world worth contending for—religion and liberty. Certainly these constitute a priceless heritage, and Baptists as a people may thank God that they have been permitted to preserve the one in its purity, and to procure the other at the greatest price that was ever paid by human hearts and hands. Indeed, the mightiest and most tragic struggle of the ages has been the one ceaselessly waged for the freedom of the soul. It is entirely safe to say that no battle known to history has cost so much in tears and blood, and brought such blessings, alike to the victor and the vanquished.

Probably the earliest recorded plea in behalf of religious liberty was made by Tertullian, who lived in the third and fourth centuries of the Christian era. This Christian hero, in his splendid advocacy of the Baptist principles of religious liberty, said:

"It is easily seen to be unjust to compel free people against their will to offer sacrifice, for in the acts of religious services a willing mind is required. It should be counted quite absurd for one man to compel another to do honor to the gods."

From the days of Constantine, when Christianity became a state religion, till this good day and hour, there has never been a time when there were not those who were ready to suffer, and, if need be, to die, for the imperishable principles of soul liberty. As early as the fourth century, the Donatists, who were Baptists in theory and practice, if not in name, earnestly contended that the conscience should not be coerced, and that the state and the churches were separate and distinct institutions. In spite of persecution, and death to many of their numbers, they resisted the right of the state to dictate in religious matters, and by their sufferings and lives sanctified the struggle for religious freedom. Speaking of these people, Neander says: "For the first time the ideas which Christianity, as opposed to the pagan religion of the state, had first made men distinctly conscious of, became an object of contention within the state itself—the ideas concerning

universal, inalienable human rights, concerning liberty of conscience, concerning the rights of free religious conviction." The Donatists as declared by Neander, and generally conceded by church historians, were afterwards merged with the Waldenses, who for centuries continued to contend for the rights of conscience, and its corollary, separation of church and state.

Other denominations sought to establish themselves by alliances with the state, and too frequently by becoming the persecutors of their brethren. The Mennonites, who sprang out of the Waldenses in 1536 (Mosheim, Cent. XVI., Sec. 3, part 2, chap. 111), contended for perfect liberty of conscience, and that the magistrates had no right to interfere with religious convictions. This opinion is founded on "the one principle" which, as Mosheim justly remarks, is at the basis of all their peculiarities; *i. e.,* "the Kingdom which Christ has established on earth is a visible society or company, in which is no place for any but holy or pious persons. In this they have always persevered, and when, about the year 1820, on the publication of the proofs of their ancient origin, by Professor Upeij and Dr. Dermont,

they were offered Government support by the King of the Netherlands, and recognition as a state religion, they declined the bounty on the ground that it was contrary to their oldest and most settled principles." In this report by Professor Upeij and Dr. Dermont, the Baptists were declared to be the oldest of all the denominations, and that their origin dated back to the earliest Christian times.

It is a fact, that can not be denied, that all the great Reformers held that the state had a right to coerce in matters of religion. Martin Luther preached and practiced the right to force men to hold a certain faith. He says: "I am averse to the shedding of blood. It is sufficient that they should be banished." Of the Jews he said: "Their synagogues should be leveled with the ground, and their houses burned, and their books, even to the Old Testament, taken from them." Several of the Baptists were put to death by the Lutherans, "for propagating their errors, contrary to the judgment of the Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel" (*Struggles and Triumphs of Religious Liberty,* p. 87). In vain have the friends and followers of John Calvin tried to acquit him of the death of

Servetus. Calvin claimed that "it was by my persecution that he was imprisoned," though he did express the hope that "they might condemn him to death, though not by the terrible one of being burned." In 1618 the Synod of Dort declared that the state should punish heresy, and as a result many were imprisoned or banished (Cumberland's *Introduction to Limborch's "History of the Inquisition"*).

"These Independents, when they were compelled to leave their own country, formed congregations in the Netherlands and in America, but they were still firmly rooted in England, where the Puritans under continual persecutions became daily more violent and gloomy, and gradually a dangerous and powerful party. In their morals and manners they were eminently pious; they looked upon all earthly pleasures as sinful; their own fancies were regarded as divine inspirations, and they thought that the state itself should be subject to their democratic hierarchy. Their rejection of infant baptism, in consistency with the Protestant doctrine of faith, and on account of its want of Scriptural authority, together with their consequent repetition of the baptism of adult

believers, became the distinctive badge of their party. These Anabaptists, who made their first appearance at Zwichau and Wittenberg (1521), were nearly all put to death in the Peasants' War, but in almost every part of the country, a class of enthusiasts resembling them, but very unlike each other in moral and religious character, became the pioneers and freebooters of the Reformation" (Dr. Hase: *History of Christian Church*). The last execution for heresy in England by burning alive took place at Lichfield, April 11, 1612. At this time, Edward Whitman, a Baptist, was burnt alive.

It may be well, just here, to give more than passing mention to the attitude of Martin Luther to the Anabaptists, since, in these latter days, some have arisen who claim that Luther never persecuted any one on account of their religious beliefs. We, of course, do not claim that Martin Luther was responsible for all the persecutions of Anabaptists, for many of these he probably could not have prevented even had he so desired.

We know of no better authority or clearer light on this subject than the "Life of Luther," by Dr. Sears. Certainly his biographer did all within his power to put

Luther in the best possible light on this question.

Dr. Sears says: "Luther has been accused of inhumanity towards the Anabaptists, and when we compare him with the mild Brentz, who opposed putting them to death for their sentiments, and with religious men of modern times, we must, in part at least, admit the charge."

A letter written by Luther in 1530 to Menius and Myconius is as follows: "I am pleased that you intend to publish a book against the Anabaptists as soon as possible. Since they are not only blasphemous, but also seditious, men, let the sword exercise its right over them; for this is the will of God, that he shall have judgment who resisteth the power. Let us not, therefore, think better of these men than God himself and all the saints have done." The genuineness of this letter has never been, and can never be, successfully called in question.

"The first edict against the Anabaptists was published in Zurich in 1522, in which there was a penalty of a silver mark set upon all such as should suffer themselves to be rebaptized, or should withhold baptism from their children." This decree proving insuf-

ficient to check the alarming growth of the Anabaptists and immersion, the senate decreed that all persons who professed Anabaptism, or harbored the professors of the doctrine, should be punished with death by drowning. In defiance of this law, the Baptists persevered in their regular discipline; and some of their ministers of learned celebrity realized the severity of the sentence. Many Baptists were drowned and burnt.

It would be indeed difficult for the friends of Luther to free him from complicity in these persecutions. His power at this time was well-nigh great enough to make his will law, if not gospel.

Luther's Treatment of the Anabaptists.

The following condensed article on this subject is taken from Mr. Orchard's work on "Foreign Baptists":

The tones of authority assumed by Luther, and his magisterial conduct towards those who differed from him, made it evident that he would be head of the reformers. He and his colleagues had now to dispute their way with hosts of baptists all over Germany, Saxony, Thuringia, Switzerland, and other kingdoms, for several years. Conferences on baptism were held in different kingdoms, which continued from 1516 to 1527. The support which the

baptists had from Luther's writings made the reformers' efforts of little effect. At Zurich, the senate warned the people to desist from the practice of rebaptizing, but all their warnings were in vain. The efforts to check the increase of baptists being ineffectual, carnal measures were selected. The first edict against anabaptism was published at Zurich in 1525, in which there was a penalty of a silver mark set upon all such as should suffer themselves to be rebaptized, or should withhold baptism from their children. And it was further declared that those who openly opposed this order should be yet more severely treated. This being insufficient to check immersion, the senate decreed, like Honorius, in 413, that all persons who professed anabaptism, or harbored the professors of the doctrine, should be punished with death by drowning.

Although the number of the Baptists—or, at least, those whom we now esteem as such, who as Mosheim maintains, under the names of Waldenses, Wickliffites, Hussites, Petrobrussians, Henricians, etc., before the rise of Luther and Calvin, lay concealed in almost all the countries of Europe—was in the aggregate very great, yet they were widely scattered, poor, persecuted and everywhere despised. Their greatest safety lay in their concealment as much as possible from public view, and so much were they out of sight that the first Reformers knew

but little of their numbers or their principles.

"Charles V. issued the terrible edict of Spires in 1529, commanding the whole empire to a crusade against the Baptists. He ordered that 'all Anabaptists, male or female, of mature age, shall be put to death, by fire, or sword, or otherwise, according to the person, without preceding trial. They who recant may be pardoned, provided they do not leave the country. All who neglect infant baptism will be treated as Anabaptists.' This was worse than anything in mediæval persecution, for at least the form of a trial had been observed; but the Protestant princes who assented to this edict left no way of escape, 'the design' being, as Keller says, 'to hunt the Baptists with no more feeling than would be shown to wild beasts.' The Peasants' War had only just closed when this ferocious edict was issued, yet it gives no hint that the Baptists were charged with sedition. The decree of 1529 was renewed in 1551, with this explanation: 'Although the obstinate Anabaptists are thrown into prison and treated with severity, nevertheless they persist in their damnable doctrine, from which they can not be turned by any amount of instruction.' If the rem-

edy lay in 'severity,' they ought to have been cured effectually, for everywhere they were treated much after the manner of serpents. A letter from a priest to his friend in Strasburg says: 'My gracious lord went hunting last Sunday, and in the forest near Epsig he caught twenty-five wild beasts. There were three hundred of them gathered together.' "

Dr. Armitage says: " 'Mild Melancthon' differed from other persecutors only in the deliberate manner in which he defended the slaughter of God's elect. The pope called their crime 'heresy'; he called it 'blasphemy'; but the victims knew only death, dealt out to them as to vipers. His mildness of manner made the pious homicide the more cruel, and he must have blushed when the three simple-hearted Baptists confronted him at Jena. He had fled thither from the pest of 1535, when a commission was examining certain poor, imprisoned Baptist peasants, and the Council invited him to act with them. The Munster disgrace was at an end, and he asked the peasants whether they were there. They replied that they had never been at Munster, and that their consciences could not approve of sedition. When he examined them on the doctrine of the Trinity they answered that,

not being learned, they could say little of that high article of faith. He demanded why they preached in secret. They replied: 'The Divine Word is relentlessly persecuted; we are not allowed to preach publicly, and now we are forbidden not only to be hearers, but doers, of the Word'."

Casper Schwenkfeld was far from being a Baptist, but he knew and loved Denk, and writes: "The Anabaptists are all the dearer to me, that they care about divine truth somewhat more than many of the learned ones."

"Voltaire, the atheist, had the common sense to say that the Baptists 'laid open that dangerous truth, which is implanted in every breast, that mankind are all born equal.' And Beard says that their sins can be easily counted: 'They did not baptize their children; they thought it sinful to take an oath; they refused military service.' The Anglican Gregory's sum of their tenets is this: 'Baptism ought to be administered only to persons grown up to years of understanding, and should be performed, not by sprinkling them with water, but by dipping them in it.' Hozek, the Catholic, gives this summary: 'The Church was to be a perfect Christian people, living without reproach, observing

the Gospel faithfully, possessing and governed by the Spirit of God.' Heppe, the Calvinist, gives this analysis of their doctrines: '1. Against all external churchism. 2. Against infant baptism. 3. Against any view of justification that does not involve santification, by the direct and essential indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the human heart'."

John Bunyan.

This cruelly persecuted Baptist preacher, whose name is now universally revered, and whose fame is as secure as the foundations of truth, was convicted in November, 1660, on the charge of being "a common upholder of several unlawful meetings and conventicles, to the disparagement of the Church of England." He was committed to Bedford jail, where he remained for twelve years—till 1672. The justice who committed him said that he had resolved "to break the neck of such meetings as people dared to hold out of the Established Church." It was in this prison that "Pilgrim's Progress" was written, and which has had the largest sale of any book ever published, with the exception of the Bible. Truly his prison was liberty's

cradle. To this matchless man the whole world owes a debt of everlasting gratitude. Concerning his imprisonment he says:

"I found myself a man encompassed with infirmities: the parting with my wife and poor children hath oft been to me in this place as the pulling of my flesh; and that not only because I am somewhat too fond of these great mercies, but also because I should have often brought to my mind the many hardships, miseries and wants that my poor family was likely to meet with, should I be taken from them; especially my poor blind child, who lay nearer my heart than all besides. Oh the thoughts of the hardships my poor blind one might undergo, would break my heart to pieces! Poor child, thought I, what sorrow art thou to have for thy portion in this world! Thou must be beaten, must beg, suffer hunger, cold, nakedness, and a thousand calamities, though I cannot now endure the wind should blow on thee. But yet, recalling myself, thought I, I must venture you all with God, though it goeth to the quick to leave you." In describing the persecutions of this prisoner of hope, Macaulay says: "Of the twenty-seven years which had elapsed since the Restoration, he had passed

twelve in confinement. He still persisted in preaching; but that he might preach, he was under the necessity of disguising himself like a carter. He was often introduced into meetings through the back doors, with a smock frock on his back and a whip in his hand. If he had thought only of his own ease and safety, he would have hailed the indulgence with delight. He was now, at length, free to pray and exhort in open day. His congregation rapidly increased; thousands hung upon his words; and at Bedford, where he originally resided, money was plentifully contributed to build a meeting-house for him. His influence among the common people was such that the Government would willingly have bestowed on him some municipal office; but his vigorous understanding and his stout English heart were proof against all delusion and all temptation. He felt assured that the proffered toleration was merely a bait, intended to lure the Puritan party to destruction; nor would he, by accepting a place for which he was not legally qualified, recognize the validity of the dispensing power. One of the last acts of his virtuous life was to decline an interview to which he was invited by an agent of the

Government" (Macaulay, Vol. II., pp. 177, 178). The unjust treatment of Bunyan helped stiffen the backbone of the people with a determination to destroy that intolerance which menaced their liberties.

Thousands of other Baptists suffered in England for the faith once for all delivered to the saints. As Marsh, in his "Ecclesiastical History," says: "They were ejected from their pulpits; and subsequently were subjected to vexations, imprisonments, loss of goods and of life. Of Bunyan and countless others it may be said as of the 'prisoner of Chillon':

" 'My hair is gray, but not with years,
  Nor grew it white
  In a single night,
As men's have grown from sudden fears;
My limbs are bowed, though not with toil,
  But rusted with a vile repose,
For they have been a dungeon spoil,
  And mine has been the fate of those
To whom the goodly earth and air
Are banned and barred—forbidden fare;
But this way for my father's faith
I suffered chains and courted death;
That father perished at the stake
For tenets he would not forsake;
And for the same his lineal race
In darkness found a dwelling-place'."

William Kiffin and the Hewlings.

Concerning the persecution of these Baptist worthies, the great historian Macaulay writes as follows:

"Great as was the authority of Bunyan with the Baptists, that of William Kiffin was still greater. Kiffin was the first man among them in wealth and station. He was in the habit of exercising his spiritual gifts at their meetings; but he did not live by preaching. He traded largely; his credit on the Exchange of London stood high, and he had accumulated an ample fortune. Perhaps no man could, at that conjuncture, have rendered more valuable services to the court. Between him and the court was interposed the remembrance of one terrible event. He was the grandfather of the two Hewlings, those gallant youths who, of all the victims of the Bloody Assizes, had been the most generally lamented. For the sad fate of one of them, James was in a peculiar manner responsible. Jeffreys had respited the younger brother. The poor lad's sister had been ushered by Churchill into the royal presence, and had begged for mercy; but the king's heart had been obdurate. The misery of the

whole family had been great; but Kiffin was most to be pitied. He was seventy years old when he was left destitute, the survivor of those who should have survived him. The heartless and venal sycophants of Whitehall, judging by themselves, thought that the old man would easily be propitiated by an alderman's gown, and by some compensation in money for the property which his grandsons had forfeited.

Penn was employed in the work of seduction, but to no purpose. Kiffin was ordered to attend at the palace. He found a brilliant circle of noblemen and gentlemen assembled. James immediately came to him, spoke to him very graciously, and concluded by saying, 'I have put you down, Mr. Kiffin, for an alderman of London.' The old man looked fixedly at the king, burst into tears, and made answer, 'Sir, I am worn out; I am unfit to serve your Majesty or the city. And, Sir, the death of my poor boys broke my heart. That wound is as fresh as ever. I shall carry it to my grave.' The king stood silent for a minute in some confusion, and then said, 'Mr. Kiffin, I will find a balsam for that sore'" (Macaulay, Vol. II., p. 178).

Bancroft says of the German Anabaptists: "The plebeian sect of Anabaptists, 'the scum of the Reformation,' with greater consistency than Luther, applied the doctrine of the Reformation to the relations of social life, and threatened end to kingcraft, spiritual dominion, tithes, and vassalage. The party was trodden underfoot, with foul reproaches and most arrogant scorn, and its history is written in the blood of myriads of the German peasantry; but its principles, safe in their immortality, escaped with Roger Williams to Providence; and his colony is the witness that naturally the paths of the Baptists were paths of freedom, pleasantness and peace" (Bancroft, Vol. II., p. 459). Surely this is a great testimony.

In Augsburg, in June, 1530, Melancthon presented to Emperor Charles a confession of faith that condemned Baptists because they commanded that children could be saved without baptism. At this time, except among Baptists, it was generally believed that children of ungodly parents, dying in infancy, were lost.

Fuller tells us that in 1538 "four Anabaptists—three men and one woman—bare fagots at St. Paul's Cross, and, three days

after, a man and a woman of their sect were burned in Smithfield."

During the whole of the sixteenth century, and through the greater part of the seventeenth, whatever changes took place in the state church, the Baptists in England, with other dissenters, continued to suffer persecution.

"The early history of the Baptists, both in this country and on the Continent, is very obscure. Thus it happened that the Baptists, or, as their opponents called them, the Anabaptists (or as Zwingli names them, Catabaptists), were strenuously opposed by all other sections of the Christian church, and it was regarded by almost all of the early reformers to be the duty of the civil magistrate to punish them with fine and imprisonment and death."

Zwingli, in the second part of his *"Elendo Contra Catabaptists,"* published in 1527, professes to give a literal translation of seven articles of their faith. The first relates to baptism, and is as follows: "Baptism ought to be given to all who have been taught repentance and a change of life and who in truth believe that through Christ their sins are blotted out, etc."

The Protestant Council of Zurich had scarcely won its own liberty when it passed a decree, as Zwingli himself reports, that any person who administered Anabaptism should be drowned. In accordance with this decree, Felix Mantz, one of the leaders of the Anabaptists who had been associated with Zwingli as a student and in the commencement of the work of the Reformation, was executed.

Fox relates that "the registers of London make mention of certain Dutchmen, counted for Anabaptists, of whom ten were put to death in sundry places in the realm—Anno 1535."

In 1536 Henry VIII. issued a proclamation in which the clergy are told to instruct the people that they ought to repent and take the "Anabaptists' opinions for detestable heresies and to be utterly condemned."

Dr. Lofton says: "In some of the essentials of faith and practice these ancient British churches—and so of the ancient Scotch and Irish churches—were Baptistic. . . . Robert Baillie and others declared that Anabaptism was the true foundation of Independency; and it is pretty clear that Browne and Harrison caught their ideals from the Dutch Anabaptists of Norwich

and other places in England. Antipedobaptism first created the ideal of Independency among the English; and then it engrafted upon this English tree the rich foliage of believer's baptism; then immersion, and finally all the principles and practices of Christ's spiritual and liberty-loving religion. The conservative Englishman was slow to become a Baptist; but when the process of development was finished, he bestowed upon the name 'Baptist' a prestige and a power in English history which have never been rivaled in the annals of martyrdom and progress, considering its small beginning and long opposition at the hands of all the world" (Lofton: *English Baptist Reformation*).

Mr. Curtis says: "Nor did the Presbyterians, when they obtained the power, neglect using the authority of the State to persecute as well as promote, in their turn. In 1638, while Roger Williams was battling for freedom of conscience with Massachusetts, and nearly thirty years after their principles had been publicly avowed in London by Baptists, we find the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland interfering with the liberty of the press and the civil

power in a manner never exceeded by Popery itself. They forbade 'all printers in the kingdom from printing or reprinting any confession of faith, or any protestation, or reason, *pro* or *contra,* in regard to religious controversies, without warrant subscribed by the clerk of the Assembly' " (*Pictorial History of England,* Vol. III., p. 472).

In 1611 the Baptists of England put forth a "Confession of Their Faith," in which they declared that "the magistrate is not to meddle with religion, or matters of conscience, nor to compel men to this or that form of religion, because Christ is the King and Lawgiver of the Church and Conscience." In 1560 the Baptists in Great Britain published their protestations against all religious persecutions, and boldly asserted the rights of religious freedom. In answering these publications, John Knox wrote: "An Answer to a great number of blasphemous Cavillations, written by an Anabaptist and adversary of God's eternal Predestination, and confuted by John Knox."

In 1610 John Smyth and other Baptist exiles determined to return to England, and soon afterwards Mr. Smyth became pastor of this brave band of Baptists. To use their

own language, they "determined to challenge King and State to their faces, and not to give way to them; no, not a foot." Mr. Curtis suggests that it is likely Roger Williams first heard of the contention for the principles of religious liberty through them. It is true that Roger Williams was then a boy, and living not far distant from these people. At all events, a great debt of gratitude is due John Smyth and his successor, Mr. Helwisse, for their writings in behalf of religious liberty, some of which are still in existence.

In 1648 the Presbyterians in Lancashire published a paper in which they said: "A toleration would be putting a sword into a madman's hand; a cup of poison into the hands of a child; a letting loose of madness with firebrands in their hands, and appointing a city of refuge in men's consciences for the devil to fly to; a laying a stumbling-block before the blind; a proclaiming liberty to the wolves to come into Christ's flock to prey upon the lambs; neither would it be to provide for tender consciences, but to take away all conscience" (Ivimey, I., 192). It is evident these men had not their own way altogether, since an order is recorded by the House, "That Mr. Kiffin and Mr. Knollys be

permitted to preach in any part of Suffolk, at the petition of the Ipswich men" (Ivimey, I., 174). It is lamentable to record that a severer law was passed May 2, 1648, than any that had been made in England since the Reformation. One article was: "Whosoever shall say that the baptism of infants is unlawful, or that such baptism is void, and that such ought to be baptized again, be ordered to renounce his error or be committed to prison till he find sureties" (Ivimey, I., 200-1; Neal, 3, 419-21).

John Calvin and Servetus.

That John Calvin and many of his followers did persecute Baptists and others, will not be difficult to believe in view of his treatment of Servetus and his attitude to those who differed with him.

"His behaviour throughout the whole affair of Servetus is too well known to need any explanation in this place; but I conceive it to be the imperious duty of every friend to toleration and the rights of conscience, to express their marked abhorrence of this part of the character of Calvin. And more especially it is the duty of those, the similarity of whose theological creed to that which he

contended for hath subjected them to the imputation of being his followers. As an obscure and humble individual of that class, I strenuously deprecate every attempt to palliate the enormity of Calvin's conduct in the instance referred to, by pleading, as many have done, that Socinus was as bitter a persecutor as himself; for until it be made apparent to my understanding how two blacks constitute one white, I must regard such pleas as extremely ill-judged. The truth is, and it ought to be avowed, that the conduct of Calvin admits of no apology! It was a violent outrage upon the laws of humanity as well as upon the laws of God, and has fixed a stigma upon the character of that otherwise great man, which will never be obliterated. But let not the enemies of the truth from this take occasion, as they too often have done, to identify the spirit of persecution with the doctrines which Calvin held. His conduct, in this particular, has drawn tears of lamentation and regret from the eyes of thousands, since his time, on account of the reproach it has brought upon the way of truth, 'causing it to be evil spoken of,' and it will continue to suffuse with all the consciousness of shame the cheeks of thousands yet

unborn" (Jones' *Church History,* Sec. 1, pp. 442, 443).

"But, notwithstanding these signal advantages, all his views were totally disappointed by the vigilance and severity of Calvin, who, when Servetus had escaped from prison, and was passing through Switzerland, in order to seek refuge in Italy, caused him to be apprehended at Geneva, in 1553, and had an accusation of blasphemy brought against him before the Council. The issue of this accusation was fatal to Servetus, who, adhering resolutely to the opinions he had embraced, was, by a public sentence of the court, declared an obstinate heretic and condemned to the flames" (Mosheim's *Church History,* Sec. 3, p. 503).

Roger Williams.

Bancroft, in speaking of Roger Williams, says: "The little colony, now counting not many more than one thousand souls, while it developed its principles with unflinching courage, desired to avoid giving scandal to the civil and ecclesiastical government in England. Williams was on the point of returning to bring over his wife; his church stood in special need of a teacher in his ab-

sence, and a young minister 'lovely in his carriage,' 'godly and zealous, having precious gifts,' opportunely arrived in Lyon. It was Roger Williams. 'From his childhood the Father of lights and mercies touched his soul with a love to Himself, to his only begotten Son, the true Lord Jesus, and his Holy Scriptures.' In the forming period of his life he had been employed by Sir Edward Coke, and his natural inclination to study and activity was spurred on by the instruction and encouragement of the statesman, who was then, 'in his intrepid and patriotic old age, the strenuous asserter of liberty on the principles of ancient laws,' and by his writings, speeches and example lighted the zealous enthusiast on his way Through the affection of the great lawyer, who called him endearingly his son, 'the youth,' in whom all saw good hope, was sent to the Charter House in 1621, and passed with honor from that school to Pembroke College, in Cambridge, where he took a degree; but his clear mind went far beyond his patron in his persuasions against bishops, ceremonies and the national church; and he was pursued by Laud out of his native land. He was not much more than thirty years of age; but his mind had

already matured a doctrine which secures him an immortality of fame, as its application has given religious peace to the American world. A fugitive from English persecution, he had revolved the nature of intolerance, and had arrived at its only effectual remedy, the sanctity of conscience. In soul matters he would have no weapons but soul weapons. The civil magistrates should restrain crime, but never control opinion; should punish guilt, but never violate inward freedom. The doctrine contained within itself an entire reformation of theological jurisprudence: it would blot from the statute-book the felony of nonconformity; would quench fires that persecution had so long kept burning; would repeal every law compelling attendance on public worship; would abolish tithes and all forced contributions to the maintenance of religion; would give an equal protection to every form of religious faith, and never suffer the force of the Government to be employed against the dissenters' meeting-house, the Jewish synagogue, or the Roman cathedral. In the unwavering assertion of his views he never changed his position; the sanctity of conscience was the great tenet, which, with all

its consequences, he defended as he first trod the shores of New England; and in his extreme old age it was the last pulsation of his heart. The doctrine was a logical consequence of either of the two great distinguishing principles of the Reformation, as well of justification by faith alone, as of the equality of all believers; and it was sure to be one day accepted by the whole Protestant world. But it placed the young emigrant in direct opposition to the system of the founders of Massachusetts, who were bent on making the State a united body of believers" (Bancroft: *History of United States,* Vol. I., pp. 361, 362).

Roger Williams landed at Boston, February 5, 1631. He had been a minister of the Church of England, a student at Jesus College, Oxford, and a *protege* of Sir Edward Coke. Roger Williams had become disgusted with the corruptions of the Church of England, and he sought a home in the Puritan colony of Massachusetts. But when he found the Puritan church at Boston still holding communion with the Church of England, he refused to unite with the church in Boston, and went to Salem, and commenced his ministry April 12, 1631.

But his sentiments were quite in advance of the Puritans. He boldly preached religious liberty, liberty of conscience and liberty of worship, and declared that the civil magistrate had no right to coerce the consciences of men nor inflict civil penalties upon men for their forms of religious faith and worship.

These sentiments produced agitation and opposition. The General Court, as their Legislature was called, passed a law at Boston, May 18, 1631, "That no man should hereafter be admitted as a freeman, to have a vote in their Government, but a member in some of their churches" (Backus' *Church History,* p. 33), thus disfranchising dissenters.

A writer who had himself been imprisoned for conscience' sake—Rev. Isaac Backus—charitably remarks concerning Governor Winthrop, "Perhaps he, and many rulers and teachers among them, were as wise and pious men as any who ever undertook to establish religion upon earth by human laws."

In 1634 Roger Williams returned to Salem as assistant to the pastor, Mr. Skelton, and after his death became the pastor; but he was often called before the General Court to

answer for his opinions (Gammel's *Life of Williams,* p. 29).

In January, 1636, he was banished; but his persecutors, fearing that he would establish another colony, determined to send him back to England. But when the officers went to his house to arrest him and put him on board the ship, he was gone. He had fled into the wilderness among the savages from the persecutions of his brethren, the Puritans. But the savages furnished him a home which the Puritans denied him. "For fourteen weeks I knew not what bed or bread did mean," said he, in recounting his wanderings in dead of winter through the forests and among the Indians.

Roger Williams, while preaching at Plymouth and Salem, had made the acquaintance and secured the friendship of their leading chiefs—Massasoit, the father of King Philip, and the Narragansett chiefs, Canonicus and Miantonomo. He had previously traveled among them, and with great self-sacrifice and patient endurance, "lodged with them in their filthy, smoky holes, to gain their tongue" (Gammel's *Life of Williams,* p. 25; Underhill, p. 235), to learn their language that he might do them good.

His acquaintance and friendship with the Indians not only provided him a shelter when driven by his Christian brethren from human civilization, but it enabled him soon after, though at the peril of his life, to break up the plan of the Pequot Indians to massacre the Massachusetts colonists, etc., and in after years to preach the gospel to these savages. He was the first of the American pilgrims to convey to these savage tribes the message of salvation (Underhill, p. 235).

Roger Williams was welcomed by Canonicus and Miantonomo to Narragansett Bay, where he founded the city of Providence and the colony of Rhode Island. He purchased the lands of the Indians, that he might make it a "shelter for persons distressed for conscience" (Underhill, p. 236).

Mr. John Haynes, the Governor of Massachusetts, who pronounced the sentence of banishment on Roger Williams, within two years removed to Hartford, Connecticut, where he afterwards said to Williams: "I think I must confess to you that the most wise God hath provided and cut out this part of his world for a receptacle and refuge of all sorts of consciences."

At all events, the Salem Church sent an

invitation to Williams to come there and take the place of the deceased Higginson as their teacher. The General Court wrote to them in remonstrance, citing Williams' opinions; but he had already been chosen, and perhaps Endicott was not sorry to show his independence of Winthrop. The reproaches and ill will of Boston, however, may have helped in making Salem uncomfortable for Williams. At all events, four months afterward he removed to Plymouth as assistant to Rev. Ralph Smith. After a couple of years there, the magistracy of Plymouth were relieved to hear that he was going back to Salem, in disappointment at not making more converts by 'venting divers of his own singular opinions, and seeking to impose them upon others. They feared, which afterwards came to pass, that he would run' a 'course of rigid separation and anabaptistry.'

"One of the singular opinions he had vented, in a treatise submitted to the magistrates, was that the charter of the colony was valueless, because the King had no claim to the territory: the only valid title was by purchase and cession from the Indian owners" (Ridpath's *History of the World,* Vol. II., pp. 900, 901).

"The founding of Rhode Island will be reserved for a separate chapter. Suffice it to say here that one of the leaders was Rev. John Clark, a physician of Bedfordshire, England, who had become the pastor of the Baptist Church in Rhode Island, said to be the first of that demonstration in America. His teachings were odious to the Puritans. In 1651 he, with two others, paid a visit to Lynn, Massachusetts. At the house of their stay, on Sunday they held a religious service with the family and three or four others. Before the exercises were concluded, two constables came in with a warrant of arrest for the preachers, who were not permitted to go on bail, but compelled to go in the afternoon to the orthodox service. There Clark and his companions sat with their hats on until the badges of irreverence were snatched away by the constables. Then the three offenders were lodged in a Boston jail on the charge of disturbing public worship.

"When their trial came on ten days afterwards, the charges were that they had held religious services at a private house, and worn their hats in church. Governor Endicott (who succeeded Winthrop in 1649) declared that they ought to be put to death;

but the court sentenced them to be whipped to pay their fines. A seemingly impossible curse was pronounced upon them by Rev. John Wilson, as they went forth to receive their punishment. Endicott had the indiscretion to say that their abominable doctrines could be easily refuted by the Boston ministers; but when Clark gladly accepted the challenge, the champions of the other side prudently receded. They did not wish the antinomian experience repeated In the end, Clark and Crandall escaped the public whipping through the payment by friends of the fines ($100 and $125 respectively) imposed upon them. But the Rev. Obadiah Holmes could not or would not pay his fine of $150, and was accordingly punished by a public whipping—thirty lashes upon his naked body, with all the strength an angry bigot could put into the strokes.

"Strange are the revulsions to which human nature is subject! There are some things—many things—will not at the last endure. Not a few who had witnessed the whipping rushed forward when the brutal thing was finished, and tendered their sympathies and consolation. Perhaps not one but sympathized with the man whose bloody

back witnessed, more eloquently than words, to the sincerity of his heart and the uprightness of his life. This infuriated the magistrates still more, and writs were issued for the apprehension of the sympathizers. But there were more decent counsels; only two persons were brought to trial, and those lightly fined" (Ridpath's *History of the World,* Vol. II., pp. 922, 923).

"On his return from England, Roger Williams had been met at Seekonk by his friends, in fourteen canoes, and conducted in triumph to Providence. He was 'elevated and transported out of himself' by this demonstration, and by the prospect of a speedy end to all his troubles. The settlements had been recognized by the highest authority in England, and permission had been given to incorporate them into a single government, under an instrument which confirmed their political and religious theories. No mention was made of religion, the charter affecting civil government alone. The only restriction imposed was that laws of the colony should conform to those of England as nearly as circumstances would permit" (Ridpath's *History of the World,* Vol. II., p. 1046).

"The occasion of a letter from Williams to the town of Providence was another letter, affirming that 'it was blood-guiltiness and against the rule of the gospel to execute judgment upon trangressors against the public or private weal." Williams replied:

" 'That ever I should speak or write a letter that tends to such an infinite liberty of conscience is a mistake, and which I have ever disclaimed and abhorred. To prevent such mistakes, I at present shall only propose this case. There goes many a ship to sea with many hundred souls in one ship, whose weal and woe is common, and is a true picture of a commonwealth or society. It hath fallen out sometimes that both Papists and Protestants, Jews and Turks, may be embarked in one ship; upon which supposal, I affirm that all the liberty of conscience that I ever-pleaded for turns upon these two hinges —that none of the Papists, Protestants, Jews or Turks be forced to come to the ship's prayers or worship, nor compelled from their own particular prayers or worship, if they practice any. I further add that I never denied that, notwithstanding this liberty, the commander of this ship ought to command

that justice, peace and sobriety be kept and practiced both among the seamen and all the passengers. If any of the seamen refuse to perform their service, or passengers to pay their freight; if any refuse to help, in person or in purse, toward the common charges of defence; if any refuse to obey the common laws and orders of the ship concerning their common peace and preservation; if any should mutiny and rise up against their commanders and officers; if any should preach or write that there ought to be no commanders nor officers, because all are equal in Christ, therefore no masters nor officers, no laws nor orders, no corrections nor punishments—I say I never denied but in such cases, whatever is pretended, the commander or commanders may judge, resist, compel and punish such transgressors according to their deserts and merits. This, if seriously and honestly heeded, may, if it please the Father of lights, let in some light to such as willingly shut not their eyes" (Ridpath's *History of the World*, Vol. III., pp. 1051, 1052).

The following letters from the *Old South Leaflets* are self-explanatory:

"To His Much Honored Governor
John Winthrop.

"New Providence, 21 of 5th monthe,
"July 21, 1637.

"*Much Honored Sir:*—My unfeigned love and refpect to your foul's eternal comfort, and firm perfuafion of your leveling at the higheft, have emboldened me once more to tell you of fome thoughts of mine own, penned and fent to some friends amongft you; which, happily, (if the good Lord fo pleafe) may fome way conduce to your foul's fatisfaction in the midft of all your troubles.

"I have been long requefted to write my grounds againft the Englifh preaching, &c., and efpecially my anfwers to fome reafons of Mr. Robinfon's for hearing.

"In the midft of a multitude of barbarous diftractions, I have fitted fomething to that purpofe: and being not able at prefent to tranfcribe the whole; yet having been long folicited by Mr. Buckley (from whom I received fome objections) and by many others, and of late by my worthy friend Mr. Peters, who had fight of them, I have thought good to fend fo much as I have

tranfcribed, to the hand of my loving friend, Mr. Buckley.

"Sir, I am bold to give you this intimation, becaufe in thefe firft loofe leaves, handling the ftate of a National church, from the thirty-eight page I have enlarged the differences between Ifrael and all other ftates. I know and am perfuaded that your mifguidings are great and lamentable, and the further you pafs in your way, the further you wander, and have the further to come back, and the end of one vexation will be but the beginning of another, till confcience be permitted (though erroneous) to be free amongft you.

"I am forry my ftates are fuch that I cannot tranfcribe the remainder, and efpecially what concerns the matter moft concerning your dear felf, and therein efpecially the affording of fome objections, but if the Lord pleafe I live, I fhall endeavor the reft, and thankfully receive any intimation from yourfelf, yea from the ftate, whereby I might myself return from any wanderings. The Lord Jefus be to you and me the Way, the Truth, and he will be the Life alfo. So pray your worfhip's moft unfeigned ROGER WILLIAMS."

"PROVIDENCE, the 24th of the 8th.

"TO GOV. JOHN WINTHROP,

"*Sir, Worthy and Well Beloved,*—I was abroad about the Pequot bufinefs when your letter arrived, and fince meffengers have not fitted, &c.

"I therefore now thankfully acknowledge your wifdom and gentlenefs in receiving fo lovingly my late rude and foolifh lines: you bear with fools gladly becaufe you are wife.

"I ftill wait upon your love and faithfulnefs for thofe poor papers, and cannot but believe that your heart, tongue, and pen fhould be one, if I were Turk or Jew, &c.

"Your fix queries I welcome, my love forbidding me to furmife that a Pharifee, a Sadducee, an Herodian, &c. wrote them; but rather that your love and pity framed them as a phyfician to the fick, &c.

"He that made us thefe fouls and fearcheth them, that made the ear and eye, and therefore fees and hears I lie not, but in his prefence have fadly fequeftered myfelf to his holy tribunal, and your interrogatories, begging from his throne thofe feven fiery lamps and eyes, his holy Spirit, to help the fcrutiny, defirous to fufpect myfelf above the old ferpent himfelf, and remembering

that he that trufteth in his own heart is a fool. Prov. 28.

"While I anfwer let me importune from your loving breaft that good opinion that you deal with one (however fo and fo, in your judgment yet) ferious, and defirous in the matters of God's Sanctuary to ufe (as the double weights of the Sanctuary teach us) double diligence.

"Your firft Querie then is this.

"What have you gained by your new-found practices? &c.

"I confefs my gain caft up in man's exchange are lofs of friends, efteem, maintenance, &c., but what was gain in that refpect I defire to count lofs for the excellency of the knowledge of Chrift Jefus my Lord: &c. To His all glorious name I know I have gained the honor of one of his poor witneffes, though in fackcloth.

"To your beloved felves and others of God's people yet afleep, this witnefs in the Lord's feafon at your waking fhall be profperous, and the feed fown fhall arife to the greater purity of the kingdom and ordinances of the Prince of the kings of the earth.

"To myfelf (through his rich grace) my

tribulation hath brought fome confolation and more evidence of his love, finging Mofes his fong and the Lamb's, in that weak victory which (through his help) I have gotten over the beaft, his picture, his mark, and a number of his name, Revel. 15. 2. 3.

"If you ask for numbers, the witneffes are but two: Revel. II., and how many millions of Chriftians in name, and thoufands of Chriftains in heart, do call the truths (wherein yourfelf and I agree in witneffing) new found practices?

"Gideon's army was thirty-two thoufand; but cowardice turned twenty-two thoufand back, and nine thoufand feven hundred worldings fent but three hundred to the battle.

"I will not by prophecy exafperate, but with (in the black and ftormy days) your company be not lefs than Gideon's to fight (I mean with the blood of the Lamb and wor dof witnef) for what you profefs to fee.

"To your fecond, viz.: Is your fpirit even as it was feven years fince?

"I will not allow the fafhion either in commending or condeming of myfelf. You and I ftand at one dreadful, dreadful tribunal: yet what is paft I defire to forget,

and to prefs forward towards the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Chrift Jefus.

"And for the evennefs of my fpirit.

"Toward the Lord, I hope I more long to know and do His holy pleafure only, and to be ready not only to be banifhed, but to die in New England for the name of the Lord Jefus.

"Toward yourfelves, I have hitherto begged of the Lord an even fpirit, and I hope ever fhall, as

"Firft, reverently to efteem of, and tenderly to refpect the perfons of many hundreds of you, &c.

"Secondly, To rejoice to fpend and be fpent in any fervice, (according to my conscience) for your welfares.

"Thirdly, To rejoice to find out the leaft fwerving in judgment or practice from the help of any, even the leaft of you.

"Laftly, to mourn daily, heavily, unceffantly, till the Lord look down from Heaven, and bring all his precious living ftones into one New Jerufalem.

"To your third, viz.: Are you not grieved that you have greived fo many?

"I fay with Paul, I vehemently forrow

for the forrow of any of Zion's daughters, who fhould ever rejoice in her King, &c., yet I muft (and O that I had not caufe) grieve becaufe fo many of Zion's daughters fee not and grieve not for the fouls' defilements, and that fo few bear John company in weeping after the unfolding of the feals, which only weepers are aquainted with.

"You thereupon propound a fourth, Do you think the Lord hath utterly forsaken us?

"I anfwer Jehovah will not forfake His people for His great name's fake. I. Sam. 12. That is, the fire of his love towards thofe whom once He loves is eternal, like Himfelf: and thus be it far from me to queftion His eternal love towards you, &c. Yet if you grant that ever you were as Abraham among the Chaldees, Lot among the Sodomites, the Kenites among the Amalekites, as Ifrael in Egypt or Babel, and that under pain of their plagues and judgments you were bound to leave them, depart, fly out, (not from the places as in the type) but from the filthinefs of their fins, &c., and if it prove, as I know affurely it fhall, that though you have come far, yet you never came out of the wildernefs to this

day: then, I befeech you, remember that yourfelves, and fo alfo many thoufands of God's people muft yet mournfully read the 74, 79, 80, and 89 Pfalms, the Lamentations, Daniel 11th and Revel. 11th, 12th, 13th, and this, Sir, I befeech you do more feriously then ever, and abftract yourfelf with a holy violence from the dung heap of this earth, the credit and comfort of it, and cry to heaven to remove the ftumbling blocks, fuch idols, after which fometimes the Lord will give His own Ifrael an anfwer.

"Sir, You requeft me to be free with you, and therefore blame me not if I anfwer your requeft, defiring the like payment from your own dear hand, at any time, in any thing.

"And let me add, that amongft all the people of God, wherefoever fcattered about Babel's banks, either in Rome or England, &c., your cafe is worft, by far, because while others of God's Ifrael tenderly refpect fuch as defire to fear the Lord, your very judgment and confcience leads you to defire to fmite and beat your fellow servants, expel them from your coafts, &c., and therefore, though I know the elect shall never finally be forfaken, yet Sodom's, Egypt's, Amalek's, Babel's, judgments ought

to drive us out, to make our calling out of this world to Chrift, and our election fure in him.

"Sir, Your fifth is, From what fpirit, and to what end do you drive?

"Concerning my fpirit, as I faid before, I could diclaim againft it, but whether the fpirit of Chrift Jefus, for whofe whole vifible kingdom and ordinances I witnefs, &c. or the fpirit of Antichrift (I John 4) against whome only I contend, do drive me, let the Father of Spirits be pleafed to fearch, and (worthy Sir) be you alfo pleafed by the word to fearch: and I hope you will find that as you fay you do, I alfo feek Jefus who was nailed to the gallows, I afk to loft Zion, I witnefs what I believe I fee patiently (the Lord afflifting) in fackcloth, I long for the bright appearance of the Lord Jefus to cofume the man of fin: I long for the appearance of the Lamb's wife alfo, New Jerufalem: I wifh heartly profperity to you all, Governor and people, in your civil way, and mourn that you fee not your poverty, nackednefs, &c. in fpiritual, and yet I rejoice in the hopes that as the way of the Lord to Apollo, fo within a few years (through, I fear though, many tribulations) the way of

the Lord Jefus, the firft and moft ancient path, fhall be more plainly difcovered to you and me.

"Laftly, You afk whether my former condition would not have ftood with a gracious heart, &c.

"At this query, Sir, I wonder much, becaufe you know what fins, yea all manner of fins, (the fin unto death excepted) a child of God may lie in, inftance I need not.

"Secondly, When it comes to matter of confcience that the ftroke lies upon the very judgment, that the thing practiced is lawful, &c., as the polygamy of the Saints, the building of the Temple, (if David had gone on) the many falfe minifteries and miniftrations (like the ark upon the new cart) which from Luther's times to this day, God's children have confcientiously practiced. Who then can wonder (and yet indeed who can not but wonder) how a gracious heart, before the Lord's awakening, and calling, and drawing out, may lie in many abominations?

"Two inftances I fhall be bold to prefent you with. Firft, do you not hope Bifhop Ufher hath a gracious heart? and fecondly,

Do you not judge that own heart was gracious even when (with poifoned fhirt on your back) you, &c.?

"But while another judgeth the condition fair, the foul that fears, doubts, and feels a guilt hath broken bones, &c. Now, Worthy Sir, I muft call up your wifdom, your love, your patience, your promife and faithfulnefs, candad ingenuity, &c. My heart's defire is abundant, and exceeds my pen. My head and actions willing to live as the Apoftle Paul. Where I err, Chrift be pleafed to reftore me, where I ftand, to eftablish. If you pleafe I have alfo a few Queries to yourfelf, whether you leave I will not: but will ever mourn, (the Lord affifting) that I am no more (though I hope ever) yours,

"R: WILL:

"Sir, Concerning natives: the Pequots and Nayantaquits refolve to live and die together, and not to yeald up one. Laft night tidings came that the Mohawks, (the cannibles) have flain fome of our countryman at Connecticut. I hope it is not true.

"To JOHN WINTHROP, Governor."

(*Old South Leaflets,* Vol. III., pp. 3-7.)

It is a fact conceded by historians of this period that Roger Williams' influence

with the Indians on more than one occasion saved the lives of the colonists.

"Whatever faults the exiled minister may have had, and whatever mistakes of judgments he may have made, we should never forget that he first demanded the right of entire religious liberty for all men.

"The same year Mrs. Anne Hutchinson, a woman of remarkable ability and unblemished character, attacked many of the Massachusetts clergy about their religious belief, which seem to her more of form than of faith. She lectured or preached every week, and her influence was so great that a company of soldiers that had been raised to fight the Indians refused to march because their chaplain did not agree with Mrs. Hutchinson.

"The General Court thought it was bad enough to have an Indian war on hand without having also a war of words about creeds. They decided that Mrs. Hutchinson was, as they said, 'like Roger Williams, or worse,' and compelled her to leave the colony. Later, the Baptists were forbidden to preach in Massachusetts and were punished when they refused to obey the command" (*Lead-*

ing Facts of American History, by Montgomery, p. 85).

Persecutions in Massachusetts.

On July 20, 1651, Obadiah Holmes, John Clark and John Crandall, Baptist ministers from Newport, Rhode Island, were arrested near Lynn, Massachusetts, while preaching on the Sabbath, taken by the officers to the parish church in the afternoon, sent to the Boston jail, and subsequently fined—Mr. Holmes, £30 ($150), Mr. Clark, £20 ($100), and Mr. Crandall, £5 ($25).

The fines of Clark and Crandall were, after awhile, paid; but Mr. Holmes was kept in Boston jail till September, when he was tied to a whipping-post and publicly whipped. His clothes were stript off, and thirty lashes sank into his naked flesh, the executioner striking with all his might, and spitting upon his hands three times, so that he might do his utmost. His flesh was so torn and cut that for weeks afterwards he could only rest upon his hands and knees, even in his bed.

Two men who came up and shook hands with Mr. Holmes after his whipping, John Hazel and John Spur, one not saying

a word, and the other saying, "Blessed be the Lord," were fined and imprisoned for the act (*Religious Liberty,* by Bailey; Backus, pp. 77, 78).

"In 1653, the president of Cambridge College, Mr. Henry Dunster, preached a sermon, declaring that he found no Scriptural authority for infant baptism. And for this doctrine he was removed from the presidency" (*Religious Liberty,* by Bailey; Backus, p. 83).

"Rev. Dunster, first president of Harvard College, preached a sermon in Cambridge on infant baptism that caused considerable consternation. In 1855, Thomas Gould, of Charlestown, refused to have his baby baptized, because he believed the practice unscriptural. For this they censured him in their church, and punished him in their courts, for more than seven years. On May 28, 1665, he and some others united and formed the first Baptist church in Boston" (*Chaplain's Life,* 1872).

"When the first Baptist meeting-house was built in Boston, in 1679, a law was made to take it from them if they continued to meet in it. Therefore, they refrained for awhile. . . . The Boston Baptists, hearing

of this letter from the king, ventured to meet in their house again, but in March, 1680, the door was nailed up by order of the court. . . .

"In 1718, fourteen persons were imprisoned in Bristol, Massachusetts, for refusing to pay the salary of Rev. Mr. Craighead, the parish minister at Freetown. . . .

"In May, 1723, Philip Tabor, the Baptist minister, and three other assessors, in Tiverton and Dartmouth, were imprisoned at Bristol, for refusing to assess a tax upon the people for the support of the parish minister, and they were kept in prison until they could send to England and get the law set aside by the king and council. . . .

"In Sturbridge, Massachusetts, five Baptists were arrested and imprisoned in Worcester jail, and their property seized for the minister's tax, from 1749 to 1751" (Backus, pp. 101, 121, 126, 128 and 149).

Concerning the persecution of Obadiah Holmes, in Boston, the Rev. Dr. Dowling says:

"Let us roll back the dial of the world till the month of September, in the year 1651, and place ourselves, in imagination, in one

of the streets of old Boston town. See! there is a crowd passing along toward the place of public punishment and disgrace. In their midst is a man bound and handled by the rude officers of the law as a criminal; but showing in his meek, upturned countenance no tokens of guilt, and uttering with his lips the language of Christian exhortation and prayer. Who is he? and what is the crime with which he is charged?

"He is a minister of the Lord Jesus Christ, a Baptist minister. His name is Obadiah Holmes, and his crime is that he has dared to preach the same gospel, and administer the same ordinances, as those which have been maintained on the same spot by the venerated and beloved Stillman and Baldwin and Sharp, in succession, now for more than three-quarters of a century. But see! his clothes are rudely torn from his person by the coarse and brutal executioner, and this minister of Christ is tied securely to the whipping-post. Hark! he speaks: 'Good people all, I am now about to be baptized in afflictions, so that I may have fellowship with my Lord; and am not ashamed of his sufferings, for by his stripes I am healed!' His voice is silenced for a moment by the

cruel thongs of the three-corded whip, dashing the crimson gore from the quivering flesh of the man of God; and again he cries aloud: 'Though my flesh should fail, and my spirit should fail, yet God will not fail me!' 'And so,' to use the language of the meek sufferer, in relating this cruel scene to his brethren in England, 'and so it pleased the Lord to come in and to fill my heart and tongue as a vessel full, and with an audible voice I broke forth praying not to lay this sin to their charge, and telling the people that now I found God did not fail me, and therefore I should trust him forever. For in truth as the strokes fell upon me, I had such a spiritual manifestation of God's presence as I never had before; and the outward pain was so removed from me that I could well bear it: yea, and in a manner felt it not; although it was grievous, as the spectators said, the man striking with all his strength, spitting in his hands three times, with a three-corded whip, giving me therewith thirty strokes.'

"A few days later, and that meek sufferer, bruised and wounded so that for weeks he could rest only on his hands and knees, might have been seen stealthily

threading his way through the forest wilderness between Boston and Providence, to escape the constable, who, with a second warrant, was hunting again for his prey; and as he drew near to the Rhode Island asylum of freedom, the voice of thanksgiving and songs of praise might have been heard 'for miles in the woods,' where prisoners of soul-liberty had gone to meet their suffering brother, to thank God for his deliverance, and to pour oil into his wounds.

"It may serve as an index to the prevailing opinions, even in New England, two centuries ago, to mention that when this act of cruel persecution was severely rebuked in a letter from Sr. Richard Saltonstall, in England, the Rev. John Cotton, author of the reply to Williams, entitled 'The Bloody tenet washed and made white in the blood of the Lamb,' boldly justified and defended the whipping of Holmes, and the right of the magistrate to persecute, by the flimsy sophism that 'if the worship be lawful itself, the magistrate compelling a man to it, compelleth him to sin, but the sin is in the man's will that needs to be compelled'; and at that time, not a minister in New England could be

found, with the exception of the Baptists of Rhode Island, to dissent from the views of Mr. Cotton, or to speak a word in favor of freedom to worship God.

"On the 28th of May, 1665, fourteen years after the scene of persecution we have described, Thomas Gould, a member of a Pedobaptist church in Charleston, and Richard Goodall, a member of a Baptist church in London, of which Mr. Kiffin was then pastor, and seven other humble disciples, after wading through a sea of persecution, formed themselves into the First Baptist Church of Boston. Fifteen years later, on the 18 of March, 1680, the doors of their humble sanctuary were nailed up by the marshal, and a notice posted thereon warning all persons against holding any meetings, or opening the doors, 'as they will answer the contrary at their peril.' And the little, despised band were compelled to meet to worship God under a temporary covering in the yard of their meeting-house."

In New England, in 1644, a law was passed in Boston, Massachusetts, for the suppression of the Anabaptists and others. A part of this law was as follows:

"Forasmuch as experience hath plentifully and often proved, that since the first rising of the Anabaptists."

The penalty of the law was as follows: "It is ordered and agreed, that if any person or persons within this jurisdiction shall either openly oppose or condemn the baptizing of infants, or go about secretly to seduce others from the approbation or use thereof; or shall purposely depart from the congregation at the ministration of the ordinance,—every person or persons shall be sentenced to banishment."

"Backus says he 'had diligently searched all the books, records and papers which he could find on all sides, and could not find an instance then (1777) of any real Baptist in Massachusetts being convicted of, or suffering for any crime, except the denying of infant baptism, and the use of secular force in religious affairs.'

"As strange as it may now seem, for many long, long years, they, in common with the Quakers, did suffer incredible hardships from such laws as these, in different parts of this country, particularly in New England. 'It would take a volume,' says Morgan Edwards, 'to contain an

account of all their sufferings for ten or twelve years.' Yes, we may add, and extending the time to the entire period, volumes on volumes would not do it" (*The Baptist Denomination,* by Haynes, p. 299).

In speaking of the Baptists in Rhode Island, Gervinius, in the introduction to "The History of the Nineteenth Century," says:

"Here in a little state the fundamental principles of political and ecclesiastial liberty practically prevailed, before they were even taught in any of the schools of philosophy in Europe. But not only have these ideas and these forms of government maintained themselves, but precisely from this little state, have they extended themselves throughout the United States. They have conquered the aristocratic tendencies in Carolina and New York, the high church in Virginia, the theocracy in Massachusetts, and the monarchy in all America. They have given laws to a continent; and formidable through their moral influence, they lie at the bottom of all democratic movements that are now shaking the nations of Europe."

Persecutions in Virginia.

"The Code of Sir Thomas Dale, the first published for the government of the colony, dated 1611, required every man or woman in the colony, or should afterwards arrive, to give account of their faith and religion to the parish minister, and if not satisfactory to him, they should repair often to him for instructions; and if they refused to go, the Governor should cause the offender for the first offence to be whipped; for the second refusal to be whipped twice and to acknowledge his fault on the Sabbath day in the congregation; and for the third offence to be whipped every day until he complied" (Bailey; Backus, p. 38).

"Some Baptist ministers, as in Accomac County, were arrested and imprisoned as vagrants; some were pulled down from the stands, insulted and whipped, and many were imprisoned for preaching the gospel not according to the established church."

"Elders John Waller, Lewis Craig and James Childs were seized at meeting June 4, 1768, dragged before the magistrate and imprisoned for forty-three days in Fredericksburg, Spottsylvania County, Virginia."

"In 1770, Elders William Webber and Joseph Anthony were imprisoned in Chesterfield jail three months.

"In August, 1771, in Middlesex County, Elders John Waller, William Webber, with Mr. Wofford, Robert Ware, Richard Falkner and James Greenwood, were arrested while at worship, the ministers dragged from the stand, and some were thrust into the jail at Urbanna. Mr. Wofford was severely scourged, and carried the scars to his grave. They commanded him to leave the county by noon of the next day. At the same time there were confined in Caroline jail six other Baptists—Lewis Craig, John Burns, John Young, Edward Herndon, James Goodrick and Bartholomew Cheming. While thus confined, they preached through the grated windows of their prisons to crowds who gathered around. The father of Henry Clay was thus imprisoned as a Baptist minister, in Virginia, as I was informed by Rev. Porter Clay, a brother of Henry Clay."

"James Ireland, formerly a Scotch Presbyterian, but then a Baptist minister, was dragged from the stand while praying, and imprisoned in Culpeper, Virginia.

Some tried to blow him up with gunpowder under the floor of his prison, but it only tore up some of the boards. An effort was also made to suffocate him by burning brimstone at the door and window of his prison. A scheme was also formed to poison him" (Bailey; Howell, p. 38; Curry, p. 36; *Virginia Bap. Min.*, p. 120).

John Clay, a faithful, eloquent Baptist preacher, and the father of Henry Clay and Porter Clay, was several times imprisoned for preaching the gospel, thus making his contribution to the cause of religious liberty. His son, Porter Clay, was baptized by the Rev. Ambrose Dudley, of Lexington, Kentucky, and became a very useful and effective minister of the gospel. His body now rests at Camden, Arkansas. His brother, Henry Clay, in writing of his death, said: "He died in the full enjoyment of the Christian hope."

James Madison, afterwards President, wrote to a friend in Philadelphia in 1774, as follows: "That diabolical, hell-conceived principle of persecution rages among us, and to their eternal infamy the clergy can furnish their quota of imps for such purposes. There are at the present time in

the adjacent county not less than five or six well-meaning men in jail for preaching their religious beliefs, which are in the main quite orthodox." Madison himself was a member of the state church, though his brother, Governor Madison, was a Baptist.

Taylor says that "the Baptist preachers were fined, pelted, beaten, imprisoned, and hunted with dogs. Their congregations were assaulted, and even dispersed; the solemn ordinance of baptism was rudely interrupted; both administrator and candidates were plunged and held beneath the water till almost dead. They suffered mock trials, and even in courts of justice were subjected to indignities not unlike those inflicted by the infamous Jeffreys in England."

"An Act for Eftablifhing Religious Freedom, Paffed in the Affembly of Virginia in the Beginning of the Year 1786.

"Be it therefore enacted by the General Affembly, That no man fhall be compelled to frequent or fupport any religious worfhip, place or miniftry whatfoever, nor

fhall be enforced, reftrained, molefted, or burthened in his body or goods, nor fhall otherwife fuffer on account of his religious opinions or belief; and by argument to maintain, their opinions in matters of religion, and that the fame fhall in no wife diminifh, enlarge, or affect their civil capacities.

"And though we well know that this Affembly, elected by the people for the ordinary purpofes of legiflation only, have no power to reftrain the acts of fucceeding Affemblies, conftituted with powers equal to our own, and that therefore to declare this act irrevocable, would be of no effect in law, yet we are free to declare, that the rights hereby afferted are of the natural rights of mankind, and that if any act fhall be hereafter paffed to repeal the prefent, or to narrow its operation, fuch act will be an infringement of natural right" (*Notes on the State of Virginia,* by Thomas Jefferson, pp. 379, 382).

The fact has often been referred to that the Constitution of our country was modeled after the form of government used by Baptist churches. The facts in the case are these: Dr. Fishback, of Lexington, Kentucky,

wrote an article in the *Christian Watchman,* in which he relates a conversation between himself and Elder Tribble, of Virginia. In this conversation, Elder Tribble stated that Thomas Jefferson had on several occasions attended the services of a Baptist church, of which Elder Tribble was then the pastor. After one of these services, Elder Tribble asked Mr. Jefferson what he thought of the Baptist form of church government. To this Mr. Jefferson replied: "I consider it the only form of pure democracy that now exists in the world, and have concluded that it will be the best form of government for the American Colonies." This, be it remembered, was several years prior to the Declaration of Independence. Dr. Fishback's statement was allowed to go unchallenged, and certainly no one acquainted with the history of these two men will be disposed to call the veracity of either of them in question. Were corroborating testimony needed, it could be found in the fact that the fundamental principles of our church government have been embodied in the Constitution of these United States.

Certainly it is no small testimony to the fidelity of Baptists that they have perpetu-

ated through the ages the New Testament form of church government; and that they have been permitted to see this form of government adopted by the world's greatest democracy, and generally recognized as the Scriptural form of church government.

"This was several years before the Declaration of Independence. This practical exhibition of religious liberty and equality would seem then to have operated on Mr. Jefferson's mind no little in forming those principles of civil freedom and government which he afterward so ably developed and advocated.

"There has been a question raised whether it was not a Presbyterian church in the neighborhood, that Jefferson attended for this purpose. Though a matter of no great consequence, it may not be improper to remark that a gentleman of the highest respectability, and well known in North Carolina, told the writer that his attention having been called to the statement, and he knowing that the venerable Mrs. Madison had some recollections on the subject, asked her in regard to them. She expressed a distinct remembrance of Mr. Jefferson speaking on the subject, and always declar-

ing that it was a Baptist church from which these views were gathered. Indeed, a moment's reflection would show that it could hardly have been any other. For in no Presbyterian church is the business ever transacted in the presence of those who are not members, it being all conducted by 'the session,' as it is called, consisting only of the officers of the church and uniformly in private.

"The conception, the faith that calls things into existence, the confidence of the practicability of a free government, whose ultimate earthly power is vested in the masses of the community—this idea was plainly obtained by Jefferson himself, from a small Baptist church meeting month after month to govern itself by the laws of the New Testament, in his own neighborhood. It was certainly the Baptist churches of this country who were the first to suggest and to maintain those ideas of religious liberty, and of consequent limitations upon the power of the majority to interfere with the rights of the minority, which form some of the most sacred features of American liberty.

"It was thus, in more general terms, the

Church that gave men in this country a faith in self-government, and a knowledge of the only way in which it could be maintained—a faith and a knowledge that have not taken root in Europe, but which are now at work like leaven, and must work until the happiness of nations has grown out of it" (*Progress of Baptist Principles,* by Curtis, pp. 356-358).

The first amendment to our Constitution was secured through the efforts of Baptists. A considerable number of representative Baptists met in Richmond, Virginia, August 8, 1789. At this meeting they petitioned General Washington to secure an amendment to the Constitution, which would further guarantee and protect the religious rights of all our citizens. The kindly offices of Mr. Adams were secured, and a month later, with the approval of General Washington, a bill was introduced in the House of Representatives to amend the Constitution. This bill was passed September 23, 1789, and subsequently ratified by the States. It is worthy of note that the Baptist denomination was the only religious one that urged the passage of this amendment.

Just here, and quite naturally, the ques-

tion may be asked if other denominations did not contribute their quota to the cause of religious freedom. Sad to say, but nevertheless true, especially in Virginia, Baptists stood alone in their heroic struggle for soul liberty. This will readily appear from a mere statement of admitted facts. When this Baptist battle of the centuries was raging in Virginia, the Campbellite denomination had not yet entered upon its career. A generation had passed between the Declaration of Independence and the coming of the Campbells to America. No doubt this sect would have contributed its share, had it been in existence at the time.

Our Methodist brethren, at the time, were not numerous, and had not yet essayed to become a church, being still considered by the Wesleys and themselves as a society within the Church of England. The sympathies of many of them were with the Established Church. Had the battle been waged fifty years later, there is little doubt that some Methodist brethren would have played a conspicuous and creditable part.

Our Presbyterian brethren, who were quite a respectable and influential body, ran well for a season, though greatly handicap-

ped by an unfortunate agreement which they had made with the Governor of Virginia. In spite of this agreement, in the early stages of the conflict they rendered real service in this worthy cause. Later on, when a bill was introduced, in the Assembly of Virginia, which proposed that all denominations be supported by the state, and thus become state churches, our Presbyterian friends earnestly advocated the passage of the measure. The temptation to be placed on an equal financial footing with the Church of England (Episcopal) proved too great for these former advocates of the separation of the church and state, and the Baptists were left alone to win or lose, in this tragic conflict for religious freedom.

In addition to, and in connection with, their contribution to the cause of soul liberty, Baptists also played a large part in the war which resulted in the freedom of the Colonies from British rule. This natural love for liberty, intensified by the cruel persecutions that they had been forced to suffer, made them long for liberty of body and soul. Several of their number served as chaplains, one of them being chaplain on the staff of General Washington. It is note-

worthy that General Washington, in a letter written with his own hand, complimented the Baptists for the noble part they had taken in the fight for the freedom of the Colonies. This letter follows:

"MAY, 1789.

"TO THE GENERAL COMMITTEE, REPRESENTING THE UNITED BAPTIST CHURCHES IN VIRGINIA:

"*Gentlemen*—I request that you will accept my best acknowledgments for your congratulation on my appointment to the first office in the nation. The kind manner in which you mention my conduct equally claims the expression of my gratitude.

"After we had, by the smiles of Heaven on our exertions, obtained the object for which we contended, I retired, at the conclusion of the war, with an idea that my country could have no farther occasion for my services, and with the intention of never entering again into public life; but, when the exigencies of my country seemed to require me once more to engage in public affairs, an honest conviction of my duty superseded my former resolution, and became my apology for deviating from the happy plan which I had adopted.

"If I could have entertained the slightest apprehension that the constitution framed in the convention, where I had the honor to preside, might possibly endanger the religious rights of any ecclesiastical society, certainly I would never have placed my signature to it; and, if I could now conceive that the General Government might ever be so administered as to render the liberty of conscience insecure, I beg you will be persuaded that no one would be more zealous than myself to establish effectual barriers against the horrors of spiritual tyranny, and every species of religious persecution. For you doubtless remember that I have often expressed my sentiments that every man, conducting himself as a good citizen, and being accountable to God alone for his religious opinions, ought to be protected in worshiping the Deity according to the dictates of his own conscience.

"While I recollect with satisfaction that the religious society of which you are members have been, throughout America, uniformly and almost unanimously the firm friends to civil liberty, and the persevering promoters of our glorious revolution, I can not hesitate to believe that they will be faith-

ful supporters of a free, yet efficient, General Government. Under this pleasing expectation I rejoice to assure them that they may rely on my best wishes and endeavors to advance their prosperity.

"In the meantime be assured, Gentlemen, that I entertain a proper sense of your fervent supplications to God for my temporal and eternal happiness.

"GEORGE WASHINGTON."

(*Old South Leaflets,* Vol. III., pp. 4, 5.)

PATRICK HENRY'S DEFENSE OF BAPTISTS.

The following facts were derived from two men in the courtroom at the time of the trial and communicated by them to John M. Peck, who published them in the Baptist Memorial in 1845, and were reproduced by D. C. Haynes in "The Baptist Denomination" in 1875:

Go back to the period just prior to the Declaration of Independence. Imagine yourself in the old courthouse at Fredericksburg, Spotsylvania County, Virginia. The king's judges are upon the bench, and the king's attorney is present to aid in dealing justice to all offenders. Numerous are the spectators on the present occasion, for three

ministers are to be tried for no other offense than "preaching the Gospel of the Son of God, contrary to the statute in that case provided, and consequently disturbers of the peace."

Patrick Henry, who had heard of the imprisonment of these men, rode some sixty miles, from his home in Hanover County, to volunteer his services in their defense. As he entered the courtroom the clerk was reading the indictment. He pronounced the crime with emphasis, "for preaching the Gospel of the Son of God." The reading of the indictment finished, the prosecuting attorney submitted a few words, all he supposed necessary to convict the prisoners; and all that would have been necessary under ordinary circumstances. The judges were about to pronounce the ordinary verdict of condemnation, when Patrick Henry, who had entered the bar among the lawyers, arose, stretched out his hand and received the paper. The first sentence of the indictment, which was being read as he entered, which had fallen upon his ears, was "for preaching the Gospel of the Son of God." This was his keynote. He commenced: "May it please your Worships, I think I

heard read, as I entered this house, the paper I now hold in my hand. If I have rightly understood, the king's attorney of this county has framed an indictment for the purpose of arraigning and punishing, by imprisonment, three inoffensive persons, before the bar of this court, for a crime of great magnitude as disturbers of the peace. May it please the court, what did I hear read? Did I hear it distinctly, or was it a mistake of my own? Did I hear an expression, as if a crime, that these men, whom your Worships are about to try for a misdemeanor, are charged with what?"—and continuing in a low, solemn tone—" 'for preaching the Gospel of the Son of God'!" Pausing amidst the most profound silence and breathless astonishment of his hearers, he slowly waved the paper three times around his head, then, lifting up his hands and eyes to heaven, with extraordinary and impressive energy he exclaimed, "Great God!" The exclamation, the action, the burst of feeling from the audience, were all overpowering. Mr. Henry resumed: "May it please your Worships: in a day like this, when truth is about to burst her fetters, when mankind are about to be raised to

claim their natural and inalienable rights, when the yoke of oppression which has reached the wilderness of America, and the unnatural alliance of ecclesiastical and civil power is about to be dissevered—at such a period, when liberty—liberty of conscience—is about to wake from her slumberings, and inquire into the reason of such charges as I find exhibited here to-day in this indictment!"

Another fearful pause, while the speaker alternately cast his sharp, piercing eyes on the court and the prisoners, and resumed: "If I am not deceived, according to the contents of the paper which I now hold in my hand, these men are accused of preaching the Gospel of the Son of God. Great God!"

Another long pause, during which he again waved the indictment around his head.

Resuming his speech: "May it please your Worships: there are periods in the history of man when corruption and depravity have so long debased the human character that man sinks under the weight of the oppressor's hand, and becomes his servile, abject slave; he licks the hand that

smites him; he bows in passive obedience to the mandates of the despot, and in this state of servility he receives his fetters of perpetual bondage. But, may it please your Worships, such a day has passed away. From the period when our fathers left the land of their nativity for settlement in these American wilds, for liberty—for civil and religious liberty—for liberty of conscience, to worship their Creator according to their conceptions of Heaven's revealed will; from the moment they placed their feet on the American continent, and in the deeply imbedded forests sought an asylum from persecution and tyranny—from that moment despotism was crushed; her fetters of darkness were broken, and Heaven decreed that man should be free—free to worship God according to the Bible. Were it not for this, in vain have been the efforts and sacrifices of the colonists; in vain were all the sufferings and bloodshed to subjugate this new world, if we, their offspring, must still be oppressed and persecuted. But, may it please your Worships, let me inquire once more, for what are these men about to be tried? This paper says: 'for preaching the Gospel of the Son of God'! Great God!

for preaching the Saviour to Adam's fallen race."

After another pause, in tones of thunder he inquired:

"What law have they violated?" Then, for the third time, in a slow, dignified manner, he lifted his eyes to heaven and waved the indictment around his head. The court and the audience were wrought up to the most intense pitch of excitement. The face of the prosecuting attorney was pale and ghastly, and he appeared unconscious that his whole body was agitated with alarm; and the judge in a tremulous voice put an end to the scene, now becoming extremely painful, by the authoritative command:

"Sheriff, discharge these men."

To any one who doubts the full truth of this incident, we would respectfully suggest that he compose a speech and try to pass it off as one of Patrick Henry's orations.

Any one acquainted with the speeches of this great orator will readily recognize, not only his arrangement of words, but his dramatic style, as evidenced in this masterpiece.

Jefferson's "Notes on Virginia."

"The firft fettlers in this country were emigrants from England, of the Englifh church, juft at a point of time when it was flufhed with complete victory over the religious of all other perfuafions. Poffeffed, as they became, of the powers of making, adminiftering, and executing the laws, they fhewed equal intolerance in this country with their Prefbyterian brethren, who had emigrated to the northern government. . . .

"If no capital execution took place here, as did in New England, it was not owing to the moderation of the church, or fpirit of the Legiflature, as may be inferred from the law itfelf; but to hiftorical circumstances which have not been handed down to us. The Anglicans retained full poffeffion of the country about a century. Other opinions began then to creep in, and the great care of the government to fupport their own church, having begotten an equal degree of indolence in its clergy, two-thirds of the people had become diffenters at the commencement of the prefent revolution" (*Notes on Virginia,* Query XVII., pp. 261, 262).

Continental Congress, 1774.

"The first Continental Congress ever held was in 1774, in Philadelphia, two years before the Declaration of Independence. It had not been in session ten days before these committees, as representatives of the denomination, memorialized Congress that they united with their country in defence of its privileges, and besought them to secure at once the recognition of the inalienable rights of conscience. Committees were appointed, and the whole subject was discussed with much earnestness. If no immediate result followed, the final effect fully realized the most sanguine hopes. For a time one of the leading men of Massachusetts, on his return from Congress, endeavored to use the matter to excite popular prejudice against the Baptists. But it failed, and only showed that the matter had not dropped before the Continental Congress until the four delegates from Massachusetts had pledged themselves 'to use their influence in favor of the religious liberty' the Baptists there contended for. And when, at the meeting of the Provincial Congress of Massachusetts shortly afterward, the

Baptists presented themselves and requested to realize the good effect of this influence, the following resolution was adopted, which the great change of popular feeling fully endorsed:

"'IN PROVINCIAL CONGRESS,
"'December 9, 1774.

"'On reading the memorial of the Rev. Isaac Backus, agent to the Baptist Churches in this Government,

"'*Resolved,* That the establishment of civil and religious liberty to each denomination in the province is the sincere wish of this Congress; but being by no means vested with powers of civil government, whereby they can redress the grievances of any person whatever, they therefore recommend to the Baptist churches that when a General Assembly shall be convened in this Colony, they lay the real grievances of said churches before the same; when and where their petition will most certainly meet with all that attention due to the memorial of a denomination of Christians so well disposed to the public weal of their country.

"'By order of the Congress,
"'JOHN HANCOCK, President.'

"Accordingly the Baptists memorialized the next session of the Massachusetts Legislature, 1775. In doing so they said: 'Our real grievances are, that we as well as our fathers, have from time to time been taxed on religious accounts where we were not represented, and our causes have been tried by interested judges. For a civil Legislature to impose religious taxes is, we conceive, a power which their constituents never had to give, and therefore going entirely out of their jurisdiction. We are persuaded that an entire freedom from being taxed by civil rulers to religious worship is not a mere favor from any man or men in the world, but a right and property granted us by God, who commands us to stand fast in it. We should wrong our consciences by allowing that power to men which we believe belongs only to God.

"This memorial was debated and referred to a committee, who reported favorably, and a bill was brought in, read once, and a time set for its second reading; but, being crowded out by other business, the Baptists were shuffled for a time out of what none now pretended to be other than just, and the last relics of Church and

State were not abolished in Massachusetts until 1832" (Curtis: *The Progress of Baptist Principles,* pp. 54-56).

Religious Liberty in Maryland.

It has been claimed by some that religious liberty was first introduced through the efforts of Lord Baltimore, in Maryland. The best possible refutation of this contention is found in the "Act of Toleration" itself. This boasted "Act of Toleration" was passed by the Maryland Assembly in 1649. Concerning this act we quote the following: "The 'Act of Toleration' did, indeed, but carry out a policy coeval with the settlement of the colony, and lately confirmed by the oath imposed upon the governor. The first four sections of this celebrated act exhibit, however, but little of a tolerant spirit. Death, with forfeiture of land and goods, is denounced against all 'who shall blaspheme God, or shall deny the Holy Trinity, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, or the Godhead, or any of the Trinity, or the unity of the Godhead, or shall use or utter any reproachful speeches against the Holy Trinity.' Strange as it may seem, this penalty of death remained

for two hundred years, still darkening the statute-book of Maryland! Fine, whipping and banishment for the third offence are denounced aginst all 'who shall utter any reproachful words or speeches concerning the Virgin Mary, or the holy apostles or evangelists.' Fine, and the defect of goods, whipping, and a public apology are to be the punishment for calling any person within the colony in a reproachful manner, heretic, schismatic, Idolator, Puritan, Presbyterian, Independent, popish, priest, Jesuit, Lutheran, Calvinist, Anabaptist, Brownist, Antinomian, Barrowist, Roundhead, Separatist, or other name or term, in a reproachful manner, relating to matters of religion.' Similar penalties are imposed for profaning the Sabbath, or Lord's day, called Sunday, by any uncivil or disorderly recreation, or by work. After this incongruous preface, the fifth section sets out 'that the enforcing the conscience in matters of religion hath frequently fallen out to be of dangerous consequence in those commonwealths where it hath been practiced; and therefore enacts that, 'for the more quiet and peaceful government of the province, and the better to preserve mutual

love and unity, no person professing to believe in Jesus Christ shall be molested or discountenanced on account of his religion, nor interrupted in the free exercise of it; breaches of this section to be punished by fine and imprisonment.'

"Policy, it is evident, had a much greater share in the enactment of this act than any enlightened view of the rights of opinion, of which, indeed, it evinces but a very limited and confused idea. Now that the Puritans were triumphant in England, an exclusively Catholic colony would not have been tolerated for a moment. The sole chance of securing to the Catholics the quiet enjoyment of their faith consisted in bestowing a like liberty on the Protestants —a policy, indeed, upon which Baltimore had found it necessary to act from the very first planting of the colony" (*The Historian's History of the World,* Vol. XXII., pp. 602, 603).

Baptists have never desired "toleration" for themselves or others, but they have ceaselessly sought to obtain for themselves and all the children of men unqualified and unconditioned religious liberty. All that Lord Calvert, or any other Roman Catholic,

has ever accorded those of a different faith has been "toleration." Away with their toleration, we will have none of it. Unfortunately, where even toleration has been granted by Roman Catholics, it has been given under pressure, and for the hope of a like or greater reward.

How any one, after reading the famous "Act of Toleration," can claim that it grants religious liberty, is beyond our comprehension. It is, however, a very fair sample—yea, the best sample—of religious liberty yet accorded by Roman Catholics.

With gratitude to God, Baptists point to the fact that as a people they have never persecuted any one for conscience' sake. They proudly challenge the annals of human history for a single instance in which they have been guilty of religious persecution. Their record in this regard is the more remarkable as they are the only religious body who have a history, and have had the opportunity, of whom this is true.

"On the score of persecutions most writers omit those of all other hierarchies, and fix altogether on the bloody deeds of the Catholics; whereas, all rules of fair-dealing should lead us to an impartial

review of all churches which have participated in the business of torture and death for conscience' sake, and exhibit the bill of fare which each church presented to all who had the temerity to dissent from their faith and forms."

The following lines from Dr. Colts' "History of the Puritans" pretty well express the treatment accorded Baptists by the three classes mentioned:

"With the Catholics it was the mass, or the musket.
The full sacraments of the church, or tortures, gibbets and flames.
Conformity, or death.

"With the Church of England it was the prayer-book, or the prison.
The whole service of her rubric, or the severest penalties of her laws.
Submission, or Smithfield.

"With the Puritans it was the meeting-house worship, or the custody of the jailer.
Parish rates, or stakes, stripes and confiscations.
The seal of the covenant, or the statute of exile."

III.

A REGENERATE CHURCH-MEMBERSHIP

Whatever else may or may not have characterized the Baptists through the ages, they have with all, and through all, never failed in their contention for a regenerate church-membership. Indeed, if called upon to name the one fundamental and distinguishing doctrine of our people, we would unhesitatingly name that of a converted church-membership. From this differentiating doctrine come all our Baptist peculiarities. It is somewhat remarkable that not a few of our Baptist scholars have failed to give this great Baptist principle the place it has ever held with the rank and file of Baptists. The Baptist contention for soul liberty, a Scriptural church government and Scriptural baptism—all grow out of, and are predicated upon, regeneration.

Baptists abhor the idea that the fact of being born in a country with a state church

constitutes one a member of that church. This, too, in spite of faith and character. This opinion has long prevailed, though now not so generally as in former times. In other days the Roman Catholic, the Church of England and the Greek Church proceeded upon this hypothesis.

A century since, the Baptists stood absolutely alone in their contention for regeneration as the prime prerequisite for church-membership. As has been pointed out, Knapp in his "Theology" treats this doctrine as a Baptist peculiarity. With his views of a church it was quite natural for him to write that "the external, visible Church can not be a society consisting of pious Christians only, but rather a nursery designed to raise up many of the invisible Kingdom" (Knapp's *Theology,* Sec. 135).

For many years "Methodists regarded themselves as a converted society in an unconverted church." In fact, the institution of Methodism was a protest against the unconverted membership of the Church of England. Without the least fear of contradiction it may be asserted that there is nothing in the confessions of faith of the various pedobaptist denominations to pre-

vent them from receiving the unregenerate. Infant baptism presupposes and implies unregenerate members, and hence no denomination that holds to infant membership can claim to believe in only a regenerate membership. To do this would necessitate the assumption that infants are not born in sin.

The question may be asked if Campbellites do not hold to the idea of a converted membership. A glance at their position on the design of baptism will readily reveal the fact that they do not stand for a converted membership. According to their standards and leaders, they do not believe in regeneration and its consequent experience of grace. At best they can only be said to believe in a reformed and baptized membership. Admittedly they do not receive the saved into the church, but the unsaved that they may be saved. And while we rejoice in the fact that there are many regenerate people in Campbellite churches, the fact remains that regeneration is not a prerequisite to membership in their churches. For many years, and still in many places, a declaration that one believes that "Jesus Christ is the Son of God," plus baptism, is all that is re-

quired for membership. We are reminded that devils believe and tremble. They not only do not require an experience of grace, but deny the possibility of such an experience. In fact, Alexander Campbell and Moses Lard ridiculed an experience of grace, and therefore could not believe in a regenerate membership, which is only possible through an experience of grace.

Since, then, this is the only body of note, apart from the Baptists, that practices immersion, and refuses to baptize infants, and since they can not be counted as committed to the idea of a regenerate membership, the Baptists are the only people who have contended for this fundamental New Testament teaching.

That the New Testament churches were composed of spiritual members is made plain by the manner in which they are addressed: "Paul unto the church of God which is at Corinth, to them who are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints;" "To all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi;" "They that gladly received the word were baptized; and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." The members of the

churches were referred to as "saints," the "elect," "the justified," "disciples," etc.

It would be well, too, for our Baptist people to guard a little more closely the doors to the churches of Christ. When we forfeit the requirement of regeneration as a prerequisite to church-membership, we vitiate our entire contention. Let not the wild craze for numbers cause us to waver at this point.

By our age-long insistence upon this Scriptural truth, we have preserved the churches in their proper province, thus preventing them from usurping the place of the Saviour, or becoming a refuge for the unregenerate.

In all kindness, and yet in all truth, it may be said that more of false doctrine and evil consequences have come through infant baptism, which is the arch-enemy of this doctrine, than from almost any other cause. Somehow, too, our pedobaptist brethren have been peculiarly sensitive at this point. The cardinal principle of a New Testament church, if properly pursued, would forever do away with this unscriptural and unreasonable practice.

The world is doubly the debtor to the

Baptists for preserving, through the ages, in the face of the most cruel opposition, this foundation principle of a Scriptural church.

IV.

THE DEMOCRACY OF NEW TESTAMENT INSTITUTIONS

For many centuries Baptists have been the only religious body in the world whose government is modeled in exact accordance with the New Testament churches. Mr. Jefferson was quite right in his declaration that Baptist churches were a pure democracy, and the only one on the earth. We are well aware of the claim that Congregational churches constitute a New Testament democracy. That this claim is without foundation is proved by the fact that the Congregationalists have infant members, who are not allowed a voice in the government of their churches. And while it is true that infants in these churches are not considered in full and regular fellowship, the fact remains that they have been baptized (?) into the church, and have therefore, and thereby, obtained membership, and in some real and true sense are so consid-

ered by Congregational churches. Hence it is that Congregational churches can not claim to have a New Testament democracy.

Nor do the Campbellites, as generally supposed, have a congregational form of government. The fact that no member is received into their fellowship by a vote of the members, but by the minister, prevents them from laying any claim to congregationalism. There can be no congregationalism unless the membership is determined by the congregation. A large part of their business is transacted by their elders and deacons. It is true that these ruling boards often report their findings to the congregation, but the validity of these findings is not conditioned on their ratification by the congregation. Their government is a combination of the Presbyterian and Congregational, with the weakness of the one, without the strength of the other.

Apart from these two denominations, we know of no religious body that lays claim to congregationalism. To the contrary, many of them boast of not having a congregational government.

Since these are the only two denominations, apart from the Baptists, that lay claim to congregationalism, it follows that

the Baptists are the only religious denomination in all the world that believe in and practice a congregational form of government. To them has God committed the keeping of this precious truth, and they, with divine tenacity, have proclaimed it to successive generations.

Baptists believe in the deathless democracy of New Testament institutions; that a church is of the saints, for the saints and by the saints. They glory in the freedom wherewith Christ has made them free, and rejoice in the equality of all believers. They know no class or classes in Christ Jesus, and abhor the idea of a "high-browed" spiritual aristocracy. They hold that no man has a right to lord it over God's heritage, and that a New Testament church is sovereign and therefore the beginning and end of all spiritual authority. They believe in the Lordship of Jesus, and that he only is Lord of the consciences of his children, and of the churches which he instituted.

For the heaven-born truth of a blood-bought democracy, they have stood like a mighty oak on the storm-swept hills, defying the thunders of man's rage, and laughing at the lightnings of his wrath. Happily,

they have been permitted to see the partial triumph of their powerful plea. The mighty principle of democracy, of which they have been the sole custodians, has not only resulted in a larger liberty to Christians of all denominations, but in great measure has permeated the principalities and powers of all the earth. Many of the world's mightiest monarchies have crumbled to dust before the imperial power of this prevailing principle. This lofty spirit of democracy will go on conquering and to conquer, until the kingdoms of this world shall be transformed into perpetual democracies, and His kingdom into sovereign, self-governing New Testament churches. The time will come, and may the Lord of hosts hasten its coming, when there shall be neither pope nor spiritual potentate in all the earth, to lord it over God's heritage.

V.

RESTORING THE COMMISSION

For several centuries before the coming of William Carey, the Commission was a dead letter with the Christian world. Continents had long continued in darkness, without a ray of hope or a message of light. At such a time God put it into the heart of the Baptist shoemaker, or, as formerly called, "the consecrated cobbler," to lead the way in restoring a lost Commission.

In the good year of grace 1793, William Carey, with an irresistible vision of a lost and ruined world blinding his eyes, and the cry, "come over and help us," ringing in his ears and heart, exchanged his awl for the sword of the Spirit, and his shoe-shop for a spiritual workshop in lands afar.

Hervey, in "The Story of Baptist Missions," says: "Among the great beginnings of modern Christian progress was the meeting of two obscure men in a shoe-shop in the little village of Moulton, England. An-

drew Fuller had stepped in, perhaps, to ask William Carey to fasten a shoe-buckle, when, to his astonishment, he saw hanging up against the wall a very large map, of primitive make, consisting of several sheets of paper which Carey had pasted together, and on which he had traced, with a pen, the boundaries of all the nations of the known world, and had entered on the vacant spaces such items as he had found in his reading relative to their religion and their population. There sat young Carey on his bench at work, with a book placed before him. In person he is a man of small pattern, with a head prematurely bald. He is bashful and awkward, of few words; very much of a silent reader. There he sat, although he then knew it not, in training for great service on the other side of the terraqueous globe, among millions of his fellow-worms, 'blind and in love with darkness,' and led by blind guides, who in their pride and tyranny had raised themselves three or four grades or 'castes' above them. There sat the little cordwainer, learning, by all sorts of humiliation, to go down into full sympathy with every sad, hard-working and scantily fed Hindu."

When Mr. Fuller called at Carey's shop, the future missionary was engaged in writing a pamphlet entitled "An Inquiry into the Obligations of Christians to Use Means for the Conversion of the Heathen."

A good Baptist deacon incidentally discovered that the author had not the necessary means to print the pamphlet, and presented him with fifty dollars, with which to print his tract. In the following year the tract was printed, a few copies of which are still in existence.

At the Association at Nottingham, May, 1792, Carey preached a sermon on Isa. 54: 2, 3. He divided his discourse in two heads: 1. Expect great things from God. 2. Attempt great things for God. Of this sermon Dr. Ryland said: "If all the people had lifted up their voice and wept, as the children of Israel did at Bochim (Judg. 2), I should not have wondered at the effect; it would only have seemed proportionate to the cause, so clearly did he prove the criminality of our supineness in the cause of God."

One of the results of the sermon was the formation of the "Baptist Society for Propagating the Gospel among the Hea-

then." This society was organized October 2, 1792, and a subscription taken, amounting to $67.12. The difficulties encountered by Carey in connection with his departure were well calculated to have caused any but a God-called man to abandon his great undertaking. It was found extremely difficult to obtain a sufficient amount of money to make the journey, and, in addition, his own wife positively refused to accompany him. At the last moment she consented, and William Carey, his wife and her infant child of three weeks of age, and Dr. Thomas, his missionary comrade, sailed for India on June 13, 1793. After a voyage of nearly five months, they arrived at Calcutta on November 11, 1793. And so it came that God, in his good providence, honored Baptists by choosing one of their number to restore the God-given work of Foreign Missions. Surely, though Baptists had made no other contribution to the history of mankind, this alone would have justified their existence.

But not only have Baptists been pioneers in missionary enterprises, but, according to the number of men employed and the amount of money expended, they have been

blessed above all others. By their heroic efforts they have firmly established the gospel of missions for all Christendom, and blazed the way for all denominations.

Mosheim says of the missionary labors of Carey: "The first stimulus in our time appears to have been given by a mechanic of the name of Carey, and John Thomas, an equally zealous Christian. The former, being strongly inclined to preach the Gospel, had solicited and obtained the honor of ordination among the Baptists; and, at a meeting of his brethren, he proposed a question relative to the practicability of an effective diffusion of evangelical truth among the pagan communities. As the other ministers concurred with him in the affirmative opinion, he went with his family to India, accompanied by his friend, who had already preached to the Hindoos in Bengal. They were afterwards joined by some other missionaries, but were checked in their pious operations by the British Government, and therefore gladly took refuge in the Danish town of Serampore, where they opened a school, and converted some of the natives to Christianity. The Marquis Wellesley at length allowed them to travel

in those provinces which he governed; but this permission, far from being fully granted, was arbitrarily restricted. The missionaries, however, prosecuted their course without murmuring, and in some measure diminished the number of pagans" (Mosheim: *History of the Church of England,* Chap. IV., p. 752).

"And thus began chiefly those great missionary enterprises of England and America which are now truly the most successful and astonishing in the world. They have raised the Sandwich Islands to the rank of a civilized people, and are fast scattering the seeds of life, liberty and love among the heathen nations of the earth. In fact, the Word of God is at this moment exhibiting a power, through its missionary operations, as extraordinary in its political effects upon the world at large as in the early centuries upon the Roman Empire" (*Progress of Baptist Principles,* by Curtis, pp. 319-321).

Mr. Curtis well says: "The missionary system now requires no very extraordinary amount of reliance in the Word of God, because faith is largely turned to sight. But it was a very different matter when the

father of the modern English missionary movements, William Carey, sailed from the shores of England in 1793. This 'consecrated cobbler,' as Sydney Smith, with desecrated wit, facetiously termed him, was for years the laughing-stock of the Reviewers, and of the Churchmen, both high and low. For a long time he plied his awl for a living, with a Hebrew Bible and a map of the world alternately before him. That Bible he had taken for his rule of faith, and there he had read: 'Ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen for an inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.' He turned to his map of the world, blackened over all the parts yet lying in heathen darkness, and then his faith in the Word of God, and that alone, assured him of a fact to which all around him were asleep; *i. e.,* that there must be a brighter day reserved for the Church, and that it was the duty of Christians to ask the Father, in the name of the Son, and then to rise and take possession of those vast regions, in the authority of Christ, their King. It was a case of the most simple, unmixed faith in the promises and commands of Scripture alone; and against all human

encouragement and prospect of success, it led him forth without fortune and without outfit for his voyage, or permission to land, or means of support. But he went down into the well, amid its darkness, damps and vapors, guided by the bright safety-lamp of God's Word, and by it alone. The heads of the great missionary sermon showed the solitary principle which impelled him: 'Expect great things from God; attempt great things for God.' It was this implicit reliance on the Bible alone in William Carey that awoke Protestant nations to that modern missionary movement which is now beginning to reap the harvest of the world."

A swelling wave of this strong impulse soon spread across the broad Atlantic, and swept Judson and his companions to this great work, then all Congregationalists in sentiment, yet animated by the same spirit. But the feeling of allegiance to the New Testament caused Judson to become a Baptist also. In fact, faith in the sufficiency of Scripture made him all he was, all he ever became.

Nor should we underestimate the cost of the missionary contention. In the titanic battle with Hardshell Baptists and other

anti-missionary bodies, Baptists not only confronted enemies, but were forced to turn their backs upon their own flesh and blood. There is probably no more pathetic contest in history than that which was waged between Baptists and Antimission Baptists.

Not the least of their battles was their contention with Alexander Campbell. As is well known to all those who are acquainted with the so-called "reformation," Mr. Campbell bitterly opposed Foreign Missions and every missionary agency. This will appear from the following quotations: "Is, then, the attempt to convert the heathen by means of modern missionaries, an unauthorized and a hopeless one? It seems to be unauthorized, and, if so, then it is a hopeless one" (A. Campbell, in *Christian Baptist,* p. 15).

"From these plain and obvious facts and considerations, it is evident that it is a capital mistake to suppose that missionaries in heathen lands, without the power of working miracles, can succeed in establishing the Christian religion. The Bible, then, gives us no idea of a missionary without the power of working miracles" (A. Campbell, *Christian Baptist,* p. 15).

"We know that many of the well disposed are engaged in these projects; nay, it is not long since we ourselves were enthusiastic in the missionary spirit" (A. Campbell, *Christian Baptist,* p. 17).

A letter written by a follower of Mr. Campbell from Mason County, Kentucky, and dated February 16, 1825, contains the following words: "Your paper has well-nigh stopped missionary operations in this State. I hope it will destroy associations, conventions, etc." (*Christian Baptist,* p. 66).

With all his power Mr. Campbell opposed the cause of missions, and had this great anti-missionary been permitted to have his way, there would not to-day be a missionary in all the world. But the Baptists, in the strength of God, withstood him to the face and conquered one of the greatest missionaries' battles of the ages. We may be pardoned for adding here that a Baptist who is not a missionary is, in view of his antecedents, a remarkably inconsistent creature.

VI.

MODERN SUNDAY-SCHOOLS

Baptists have also constituted themselves the world's creditor by instituting the modern Sunday-school movement. We are fully aware of the view generally held, that Robert Raikes was the founder of the modern Sunday-school. That this contention has been successfully refuted is quite clear to all who have read the excellent tract on this subject, by Dr. W. B. Spillman. He clearly established the fact that Deacon William Fox, and not Robert Raikes, organized the first Sunday-school in England. The school organized by Mr. Raikes was taught on Sunday afternoon, but it was only a secular school, in which the Bible had no place, directly or indirectly. The only possible claim that can be urged in behalf of Mr. Raikes as a teacher of a Bible school is the fact that he taught the school on Sunday. And while his desire to provide an opportunity for those who

otherwise could not, or would not, obtain such education, is worthy of high praise, it does not entitle him to the place of pioneer in Bible-school work.

All too long has this figment been allowed to go unchallenged, and it is high time that the truth of history, in this regard, should be established.

That Mr. Raikes never instituted a Sunday-school movement, or taught a Sunday-school, will readily appear from the biography of Robert Raikes, written by J. Henry Harris. Certainly Mr. Harris, who was an extravagant admirer of Mr. Raikes, can not be accused of unfairness. The following quotations from the "Story of Robert Raikes" clearly establish our contention: "The first school Mr. Raikes started was in Sooty Alley, and here he commenced his studies in child life, which he afterwards called 'botanizing in human nature.' . . . on Sundays the children sat on forms or stools, but learnt little, and poor Mrs. Meredith's patience was soon worn out with trying to keep them in order. . . . girls were not at first admitted, and so you may fancy what sort of boys they were. I can tell you some of them

were marched from their houses with logs of wood and weights tied to their legs to prevent their running away. . . . You can very well guess from these examples what kind of boys Mr. Raikes picked up to experiment upon, and when I tell you that he sometimes birched them with his own hands, and sometimes marched them home and insisted on their parents leathering them, stopping to see it done, and then marching them back to school again, you will see that he was very much in earnest and 'botanized' under difficulties. . . .

"This is no fancy picture, but it is a little softer in outline and color than the original, and I am sure that we may all say that Mrs. Critchley (teacher) was a brave woman, deserving all honor for trying to teach such children their letters and to humanize them." Admittedly the purpose was to "teach them their letters and to humanize them." This, too, was a very laudable work, but it was not distinctively Sunday-school work. Neither Bible nor catechism nor Scriptural truths of any kind were taught in Mr. Raikes' school. The children were frequently punished for disobedience and not knowing their lessons.

According, then, to his own biographer, Mr. Raikes' school was not a Bible school, but a secular school taught on Sunday. Indeed, it is passing strange that Mr. Raikes should have for so long received the credit for something that he never did, and would not have claimed the credit. It is also true that the movement started by Mr. Raikes soon died and never had a direct successor.

It is absolutely certain that Deacon Fox started the modern Sunday-school movement in England, and that this movement has had an uninterrupted existence through the years. The following words from Dr. Spillman are, to our thinking, quite conclusive:

"Robert Raikes was born in Gloucester, England, September 14, 1736. Early in life he became interested in prison reform. Discouraged with the results of his labors, he was about to turn away from it, when it occurred to him that the wiser thing to do would be to prevent crime rather than attempt to rescue the criminal from a life of vice. He also had the idea that education was the cure for all moral ills. Hence, he began his new lines of work with the boy as his field of battle and the spelling-

book as his weapon of warfare. On a Sunday in July, 1780, he gathered a few ragged boys from the streets of Gloucester into the home of Mr. and Mrs. King on St. Catherine Street, and with four teachers, whom he paid about twenty-five cents per day, he began his first Sunday-school.

"This school was his individual enterprise. No church was in any way connected with it. Spelling, reading and arithmetic constituted the subjects of study. The Bible was not the text-book. The primary purpose was to keep the boys from going to jail and to make respectable citizens of them. In all of the letters of Mr. Raikes, in which he refers to his purpose, he speaks of it as his 'attempt at civilization.'

"Early in 1783, before any public announcement had been made about the work of Mr. Raikes, Mr. Fox purchased the old home estate of Clapton, and immediately organized a school for all the children of the estate, supplying books and sometimes clothing, and paying all the expense of teaching. His school met on week-days, and the only text-book for those who could read, was the Bible. The spelling-book was used for those who were

being taught, but the one purpose of this school was to give instruction in the Word of God.

"Mr. Fox soon saw the possibilities in this movement, and determined to effect an organization to spread it. At the Baptist monthly meeting at the King's Head Tavern in the Poultry, in May, 1785, Mr. Fox told of the work which he had for two years been doing, and submitted the matter of organizing a society to promote schools for the study of the Bible. The meeting asked Mr. Fox to issue a call for a general meeting to be held in the same place on August 16th, and to extend the invitation to all interested persons, regardless of denominational affiliation. The call was issued. When the matter became public, the attention of Mr. Fox was called to the work of Mr. Raikes. This was the first time that he had heard of it. He opened correspondence with Mr. Raikes and made a personal visit to Gloucester to study his work. So impressed was he with it that he determined to have his proposed organization adopt Sunday as the day, but stick to the original purpose of making the study of the Bible the prominent feature. This was done, and,

after two preliminary meetings, a meeting was called for the Paul's Head Tavern, September 7, 1785, at which time and place was organized the first Sunday-school society in the world. It was at first called 'The Society for the Support and Encouragement of Sunday-schools'; afterwards changed to 'The Society for Promoting Sunday-schools throughout the British Dominion.' "

The Real Origin of Modern Sunday-schools.

While it is true that Deacon William Fox was the earthly father of English Sunday-schools, it is not true that he originated the modern Sunday-school movement. This high honor, without doubt, belongs to the Welsh Baptists. In this connection, great and lasting credit is due Dr. John T. Griffith, who by his careful researches has demonstrated that to his countrymen is due the honor of beginning and perpetuating the modern Sunday-school. It is but just to say that few men of any generation have given their lives so completely to study and service as this beloved Baptist minister.

Dr. Griffith's book, in which are em-

bodied the results of his investigations in this regard, is entitled "Morgan John Rhys" (1760-1804). It is a critical and scholarly biography, bringing to the world truths that every Baptist and lover of truth should gladly welcome.

Strangely enough, John Rhys, who made so large a contribution to the Sunday-school history of Wales, was driven from his native land to America, to avoid persecution for conscience' sake. In this respect he differs not from the countless thousands of Baptist martyrs who have been called upon to suffer, that triumphant truth might have free course and run and be glorified.

The following quotations from Dr. Griffith's work will, it is believed, be conclusive to all fair-minded readers:

In "Lloffyn Aeddfed," a book published by the Rev. John Davies, Mynyddbach, in 1852 (one of the children of Mynyddbach like myself), a note may be seen which was written by his grandfather, Morgan John, the blacksmith, in which he says that he was taught to read Welsh in Dwncyn House when he was ten years old. We will insert the note here so that the reader can see it:

"I was taught to read Welsh in the reading-school at Dwncyn House. I went there on Sunday afternoons in order to be taught by them. I was ten years old when I learned to read at the Dwncyn House in 1697. It was at the Dwncyn House that my father was taught to read before I was born, and my mother said that she was taught to read her Welsh Bible at the reading-school of Chwarelaubach before she was married" (M. John, 1720).

"When the Sunday-schools of Great Britain were celebrating the centennial year of Sunday-schools in 1880, the Sunday-school of Mynyddbach and its branches, with eight hundred members, were at Cilfwnwr Farm celebrating the 232d year of the beginning of the Sunday-school there" (Translated from the Welsh. See *Biography of Rev. Thos. Davies,* Horeb, Morriston, by the Rev. W. Trevor Jones, Llanelly—1895, pp. 71, 72).

"By the research of Mr. Henry Blackwell, of New York, it was found that the Rev. Morgan Jones, a native of Bassaleg, Mon., and an 'ejected minister' of the reign of Charles II., came to America. Educated at Jesus College, Oxford, he settled at

Llanmadog, Glamorganshire; but, having rebelled against the Act of Uniformity, we find him in Newton Presbyterian Church, Long Island. Here he established a Sunday-school in February, 1682" (*Welshmen as Factors in the Formation of the Republic,* by the late Rev. E. Edwards, p. 23). These facts speak for themselves, the first antedating the Raikes movement 132 years, and the second ninety-eight years.

Mr. Llewelyn Jenkins, in the history of the Hengoed Church published in "Hengoediana" in 1861, quotes the following from Morgan John Rhys: "I am ready according to my ability, after having stirred your pure minds, to do what I can to scatter the darkness."

He had done this, it is said, by establishing a school in a small building in the parish of Lanvabon, near his father's home. He printed a small book to aid the young to learn to read. He also traveled the length and breadth of the principality to preach in behalf of Sunday and night schools, as well as to write for them. Also he saw the influence of the plan of periodicals. He published "The Treasury of Knowledge," which was the second periodical in Wales. These

publications have greatly enlightened Wales. He foresaw the effects on "the darkness," and he said, "I see it fleeing;" and to the friends of knowledge he would say, "Double your diligence to scatter it until it is shut up in the bottomless pit." (See "Hengoediana.") The building in the parish of Lanvabon is still standing. (See "Hengoediana.")

"There is a certainty that a Sunday-school was started at Cilfwnwr (not far from Swansea) as early as the year 1648, and that it has been kept on regularly through the years, moving with the church to Dwncyn House, and from thence to Mynyddbach. There was a Sunday-school also at the same time at Chwarelaubach, near Neath. Both churches were under the same ministry during the time of Mr. Lewis Davies, who, in the year 1693, composed a Catechism for the use of the children and young people of the Sunday-school, in order to indoctrinate and root them in a knowledge of the Bible. Those Sunday-schools have not ceased to exist since the time they were started, but have increased in strength and influence as time has passed by, and though their attendants have died from age to age,

yet those Sunday-schools are as alive and flourishing to-day as they have ever been."

It is further true that Baptists have led in nearly every real and great advance that has been made in perfecting our present Sunday-school system. Indeed, Baptists have been the pioneers in nearly every line of Sunday-school achievement, and it is impossible to write the history of the Sunday-school movement without giving to the Baptists the position of pre-eminence and prestige. And while it is not the purpose of the writer to in any way underestimate the great service that has been rendered by other denominations in this work, it is nevertheless true that they have cultivated where Baptists had planted. Dr. Spillman well says:

"It was William Henry Watson, a Baptist, who guided the affairs of the London Sunday-school Union through the era of its greatest prosperity, and who was its secretary for forty-five years.

"It was Miss Harriet Bishop, a Baptist, who, pushing into the great Northwest in America, planted the first Sunday-school in that part of our country. It was John Mason Peck, a Baptist, who, locating in St. Louis in its wild pioneer days, organized its

first Sunday-school and was for forty years the evangel for much of the Ohio and Mississippi Valley.

"It was Benjamin Franklin Jacobs, a Baptist, who took up the leadership of a disorganized and almost discouraged group of Sunday-school workers and welded them into a compact, enthusiastic working army. It was W. N. Hartshorn, a Baptist, who took up the reins when Jacobs fell, and who now guides the forces of the organized Sunday-school work of America. Jacobs it was who saw the vision of a World's Sunday-school Convention and issued the call for it. He it was who guided it as its executive officer from its beginning until he fell at his post. He it was who gave to the world the International Uniform Lesson system.

"It was Dr. Warren Randolph, a Baptist, who was the first secretary of the International Lesson Committee, which position he held for twenty-five years. It was Prof. John R. Sampey, a Baptist, who worked out the first course of advanced lessons for the International Sunday-school Association of America.

"It was Mrs. Juliette Dimock Dudley, a Baptist, who started the Cradle Roll. It was

Henry J. Howland, a Baptist, who organized the first Primary department in the world and who made the movement popular. It was Marshall A. Hudson, a Baptist, who sounded the bugle-call to the young men of America, and who, under the Baraca banner, is enlisting young men by the thousands in Sunday-school work. It was Miss May Hudson, a Baptist, who started the splendid Philathea movement for young ladies.

"It was Prof. B. H. DeMent, a Baptist, who occupied the first full Professorship of Sunday-school Pedagogy in any theological seminary in the world."

VII.

BIBLE TRANSLATION AND CIRCULATION

Baptists have, in spite of their poverty and persecution, led all others in their efforts for translating and circulating the Scriptures. This is quite natural in view of the fact that Baptists, and Baptists only, have ever held that the Scriptures, and the Scriptures only, are an all-sufficient rule of faith and practice. They, and they alone, have never acknowledged any other source of authority for their religion or life.

It will be readily conceded that William Carey has done more in behalf of Bible translation than any other man in any age. Under his direction, and largely by his own labors, the Serampore mission had up to 1832 (two years before his death) issued more than two hundred thousand Bibles, or portions thereof, in about forty different languages or dialects, besides a great number of tracts and other religious works in various languages. He also published valuable

grammars and dictionaries of Bengali, Mahratta, Sanskrit and other languages. From 1801 to 1830 he was Oriental Professor at Fort William College, Calcutta. His translations have never been displaced, but are still the accepted standards of translation.

Adoniram Judson (1788-1850) was born at Malden, Massachusetts, and educated at the Andover Theological Seminary. The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions was organized as a result of his determination to become a missionary. He was sent out under the auspices of this Congregational board, he being at the time a member of a Congregational church. On his voyage to Calcutta, a closer study of the Scriptures led him to become a Baptist. Being convinced that immersion in water, of a believer, alone was baptism, he severed his connection with his denomination not knowing from whence his support would come. His support was afterwards undertaken by the newly organized American Baptist Missionary Union.

In 1852 he translated the Bible into Burmese, and prepared a Burmese and English dictionary. His was the first translation of the Bible into the Burmese language, and

is yet the best translation in existence. On completing his translation of the Bible, January 31, 1834, Mr. Judson added this touching and eloquent postscript: "Thanks be to God, I can now say I have attained. I have knelt down before him, with the last leaf in my hand, and, imploring his forgiveness for all the sins which have polluted my labors in this department, and his aid in future efforts to remove the errors and imperfections which necessarily cleave to the work, I have commended it to his mercy and grace; I have dedicated it to his glory. May he make his own inspired word, now complete in the Burman tongue, the grand instrument of filling all Burma with songs of praise to our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ! Amen." Surely his prayer was heard and has been answered in the redemption of a multitude of men and women. What loud hallelujahs and everlasting hosannas will greet Carey and Judson, from the thousands and ten thousands who, through their labors, have been pointed to the Lamb of God for sinners slain. Certainly a debt of gratitude is due a denomination that has made possible the labors of the Baptist worthies.

John Wycliffe (1320-84) was in his later life essentially a Baptist. He denounced the Roman Catholic Church, and was in turn denounced by it.

His opinions were condemned by the University of Oxford, and his followers persecuted. He preached against infant baptism and believed in immersion.

The main characteristic of his preaching was his antipathy to formalism, and an insistence on inward religion.

His translation of the Bible became very popular, and he organized a body of Lollards to spread his teachings and circulate his translation of the Bible.

The opinions of Wycliffe were much nearer the Baptist position than that of any other body, and he held with the Baptists in their contention for the translation and circulation of the Scriptures. Bancroft says of him:

"He gave England the Bible in the vulgar tongue. A timely death could only place him beyond persecution; his bones were disinterred and burnt, and his ashes thrown on the waters of the Avon. But his fame brightens as time advances; when America traces the lineage of her intellectual free-

dom, she acknowledges the benefactions of Wycliffe."

Probably the most accurate translation of the Scriptures is the American Bible Union Version, which is solely a Baptist production.

It was the Rev. William Hughes, a Baptist minister of England, who formulated the plan that resulted in the organization of the British Bible Society. This society was entirely his idea, and its institution the result of his labors. The London *Christian Guardian,* in an editorial on his death, accords him the distinction of organizing the first Bible society.

The millions of Bibles that have been circulated since the organization of the society is, under God, due to William Hughes, and through him to the great denomination of which he was an honored member. Had Baptists never done anything else for the world but given to it millions of copies of the word of God, surely they had not lived and labored in vain.

While it is true that the British Bible Society is the oldest Bible society now in existence, it is not true that it was the first Bible society. This honor belongs to Mor-

gan John Rhys, of Wales. This brother went to Paris in the summer of 1791, for the purpose of preaching and circulating the Scriptures. "He was aided in this work by the Rev. David Jones, formerly of Pontypool, and the Rev. Peter Williams, in his Bible work in France. They prepared John Cann's Bible for him in Wales, that he might print and distribute the same in France.

"When the Association met at Moleston, Wales, in 1792, we find him there acting as moderator, and preaching from Matt. 18: 18; and at this meeting the following resolution was adopted,—'At the request of Mr. Rhys it was decided to urge the churches to take up collections towards sending the Word of God to the French, and that the money be sent to Mr. Williams, Holyhead, that he may send money to those who are to prepare Bibles which are to be published in the language of that country.' The reader will please note that this foreign Bible work was begun in Wales twelve years before the organization of the British and Foreign Bible Society in England; but in the midst of his great ideas respecting his work in France, disagreements broke

out between England and France, which compelled him to give up his work there and return to Wales" (*Morgan John Rhys,* by J. T. Griffith, p. 14).

Yet, in spite of their time-honored contention, Baptists have not yet succeeded in getting other denominations to translate the Bible. This they have refused to do, and for the best of all reasons, that a literal translation would mean death to some of their interpretations. It is nothing less than a mockery and a sin that the word for baptism should be transliterated instead of being translated. A literal translation of the New Testament literally means a Baptist book. We predict that the time will come when, for the sake of sentiment, we will no longer refuse to translate the word "baptize."

VIII.

BAPTIST PERPETUITY

Last, but by no means least among the items of the world's indebtedness to Baptists, is the fact that they have verified Christ's promise of perpetuity to his churches. Concerning his churches Christ said: "On this rock I will build my church, and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it." If these words teach anything, they teach that the churches instituted by Christ and the Apostles would never die, but would reproduce and multiply and perpetuate themselves to the end of all time. If the words of the Master are true, and they are, there has never been a moment since the days of Christ when his churches were not in existence. If there has been such a time, then the words of Christ have failed of fulfillment. Our contention is that Baptists have been used to fulfill the words of Christ, and that Baptist churches are not only identical in faith and policy with the churches insti-

tuted by Christ, but are the legitimate successors of the churches organized by Christ and the Apostles.

As has been said: "We must either suppose that there has been a Christian people existing in every age from the apostolic to the present, characterized by the same doctrines and practice, or that there were periods in the intervening history when apostolic faith and practice had absolutely no representative on the face of the earth. Are we prepared to take the latter alternative? Have there been such hiatuses in the history of Christianity? No church, no Christian people, to uphold the standard of a pure gospel, and bear witness to the truth as it is in Jesus amid a perverse and crooked generation? What, then, becomes of the Saviour's promise? Reasoning *a priori,* we must infer, I think, that there must be a continuous line of witnesses for the truth, not only as individuals, but as organized bodies, keeping the faith as originally delivered to the saints, and practicing the ordinances as instituted by the Head. It can not then be 'arrogant'—nay, it is a duty we owe to the truth—to go into a careful and thorough investigation of his-

torical sources, to find out, if possible, such an uninterrupted line of witnesses. We beg leave to ask, if the continuous line of witnesses from the Apostles to the Reformation were not Baptists, what were they? Surely no one of the present sects having no earlier an origin than the Reformation will claim them. Were they, then, Latins, Greeks or Baptists?"

It is well to bear in mind the difference between church succession and church perpetuity. Apparently, it would be impossible to establish the uninterrupted succession of any given church through the years, even should such a church have a continuous succession. As a matter of fact, many Baptist churches have not had successors. Our contention is not for apostolic succession, or church succession, but for the perpetuity of Baptist churches, from the organization of the First Baptist Church of Jerusalem to the present time, and to the end of all time.

Should any Baptist deny the fact that the first church established in Jerusalem was a Baptist church, we would like to insist that he kindly tell what kind of a church it was. To know that it was not a Baptist church implies a sufficient amount of knowl-

edge to determine the character of the church.

We may even go so far as to assert that there was a Baptist preacher before the organization of a Baptist church. The first Baptist preacher was John the Baptist. We learn from the Scriptures that he was a Baptist and a preacher, and certainly it is impossible for a man to be a Baptist and a preacher and not be a Baptist preacher.

Alexander Campbell says: "It was for having his brother's wife in his brother's lifetime which procured a rebuke to Herod from the first Baptist preacher. In ranking John among the Baptists, I hope they will forgive me; for although John lived before the Christian kingdom began, he was, upon the whole, as good a Christian as most of us Immerser preachers" (Alexander Campbell: *Christian Baptist,* Vol. VI., p. 70).

Dr. Armitage says: "Having thus found the model of the New Testament church, the question is forced upon us: Whether or not this pattern is retained in any of the churches of the present day? Without casting ungenerous reflections upon any Christion body whatever, it may be said that, as

to substance and form, the most accurate resemblance to this picture of the apostolic churches is now found in the Baptist churches of Europe and America. Dr. Duncan reports: 'That when Gesenius, the great German Hebraist and Biblical critic, first learned what Baptist churches were, he exclaimed: "How exactly like the primitive churches!"'

"The late Dr. Oncken assured the writer that in forming a new church at Hamburg, A. D. 1834, the constituent members first resolved that they would shut themselves up entirely to the apostolic model, as found in the New Testament. They therefore devoted themselves for some time to prayer and the exclusive study of that Book as an inspired Church Manual; and on comparing the result, to their surprise, they found themselves compelled to form a church in accord with the Baptist churches in England and America. Yet, there is nothing strange in this; the New Testament is ever the same, and it is but natural that when the devout mind is left free from all standards but this, with the determination to follow it in the most simple-hearted manner, it should produce the same stamp of New Testament

churches everywhere and always" (*Memoir of James P. Boyce,* by John A. Broadus, pp. 149, 150).

We may well heed the following forceful words of Dr. James P. Boyce, the founder of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary:

"But the obligation resting on the Baptist denomination is far higher than this. It extends not merely to matters of detail, but to those of vital interest. The history of religious literature and of Christian scholarship has been a history of Baptist wrongs. We have been overlooked, ridiculed, and defamed. Critics have committed the grossest perversions, violated the plainest rules of criticism, and omitted points which could not have been developed without benefit to us. Historians who have professed to write the history of the church have either utterly ignored the presence of those of our faith, or classed them among fanatics and heretics; or, if forced to acknowledge the prevalence of our principles and practice among the earliest churches, have adopted such false theories as to church power, and the development and growth of the truth and principles of Scripture, that

by all, save their most discerning readers, our pretensions to an early origin and a continous existence have been rejected.

"The Baptists in the past have been entirely too indifferent to the position they thus occupy. They have depended too much upon the known strength of their principles, and the ease with which from Scripture they could defend them. They have therefore neglected many of those means which extensive learning affords and which have been used to great advantage in support of other opinions. It is needless to say, gentlemen, that we can no longer consent to occupy this position. We owe a change to ourselves,—as Christians, bound to show an adequate reason for the difference between us and others; as men of even moderate scholarship, that it may appear that we have not made the gross error in philology and criticism which we must have made if we be not right; as the successors of a glorious spiritual ancestry, illustrated by heroic martyrdom by the profession of noble principles, by the maintenance of true doctrines; as the church of Christ, which he has ever preserved as the witness for his truth, by which he has illustrated his wonderful ways, and

shown that his promises are sure and steadfast. Nay, we owe it to Christ himself, whose truth we hold so distinctively as to separate us from all others of his believing people; to whom we look confidently to make these principles triumphant; for whose sake, on their account, men have been ever found among us willing to submit to banishment, imprisonment, or martyrdom; and for whose sake, in defence of the same truth, we are willing now to bear the scorn and reproach, not of the world only, but even of those who love our Lord Jesus Christ" (*Memoir of James P. Boyce,* pp. 136, 137).

"Trace our history back, either through the centuries that have long passed away, or in the workings of God during the last hundred years, and it will be seen that the mass of the vineyard laborers have been from the ranks of fishermen and tax-gatherers, cobblers and tinkers, weavers and ploughmen, to whom God has not disdained to impart gifts, and whom he has qualified as his ambassadors by the presence of that Spirit by which, and not by might, wisdom, or power, is the work of the Lord accomplished" (*Memoir of James P. Boyce,* p. 127).

Alexander Campbell, the founder of a

sect radically opposed to the Baptists, and at best an unwilling witness to Baptist verities, has given testimony that should convince his own people and others, that Baptist churches are the only true and legitimate successors to the churches instituted by Christ and the Apostles. The following words of Mr. Campbell are taken from the authorized edition of the "Campbell-McCalla Debate," now in our possession:

"Clouds of witnesses attest the fact that before the reformation from Popery, and from the apostolic age, to the present time, the sentiments of Baptists and the practice of baptism have had a continued chain of advocates, and public monuments of their existence in every century can be produced" (Alexander Campbell, in debate with W. L. McCalla, held at Washington, Mason Co., Ky., Oct. 15, 1823, p. 378).

A Remarkable Testimony.

In 1819 the King of Holland appointed Dr. J. Dermout, his chaplain, and Dr. Ypeij, Professor of Theology in the University of Groningen, to prepare a history of the Dutch Reformed Church, and also to report on the claims of the Dutch Baptists. Let it be re-

membered that both of these men were members of the Dutch Reformed Church, and hence their interests and inclinations were all in favor of this church. Their report follows:

"The Mennonites are descended from the tolerably pure evangelical Waldenses, who were driven by persecution into various countries; and who, during the latter part of the twelfth century, fled into Flanders and into the provinces of Holland and Zealand, where they lived simple and exemplary lives—in the villages as farmers, in the towns by trades, free from the charge of any gross immoralities, and professing the most pure and simple principles, which they exemplified in a holy conversation. They were, therefore, in existence long before the Reformed Church of the Netherlands.

"We have now seen that the Baptists, who were formerly called Anabaptists, and in later times Mennonites, were the original Waldenses; and who have long, in the history of the church, received the honor of that origin. On this account the Baptists may be considered the only Christian community which has stood since the Apostles; and as a

Christian Society which has preserved pure the doctrine of the Gospel through all ages. The perfectly correct external economy of the Baptist denomination tends to confirm the truth disputed by the Romish Church, that the Reformation brought about in the sixteenth century was in the highest degree necessary; and at the same time goes to refute the erroneous notion of the Catholics, that their communion is the most ancient" (*Encyclopædia of Religious Knowledge*).

Some years since, a Baptist of pedobaptist proclivities is said to have called in question the genuineness of the above report; whereupon Dr. W. P. Harvey addressed a letter in this connection to Prof. George B. Manly, then president of a college of languages in Berlin, Germany. Dr. Manly's reply was as follows:

"BERLIN, den 14, Jan. 1896.

"REV. W. P. HARVEY, D.D., Louisville, Ky.

"*My Dear Sir:*—In reply to your favor of December 6, 1895, in which you inquire as to the authenticity of a passage quoted in Baptist histories, and now called in question by a prominent writer, I take pleasure in stating that the passage is genuine, and the translation gives the thought correctly.

It is found on page 148, Volume I., of the work entitled 'History of the Dutch Reformed Church,' by A. Ypeij, Doctor and Professor of Theology at Groningen, and I. J. Dermout, Secretary of the General Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church, and Preacher at The Hague, at Breda, 1819. . . .

"Yours fraternally,

"G. W. Manly."

The original work containing this report is now in the Royal Library at Berlin.

The History of the Anabaptists or Mennonites.

"The true origin of that sect which acquired the denomination of Anabaptists by their administering anew the rite of baptism to those who came over to their communion, and derived that of Mennonites from the famous man to whom they owe the greatest part of their present felicity, is hidden in the depths of antiquity, and is, of consequence, extremely difficult to be ascertained. This uncertainty will not appear surprising when it is considered that this sect started up suddenly in several countries, at the same point of time, under leaders of different talents and different intentions, and

at the very period when the first contests of the reformers with the Roman pontiffs drew the attention of the world, and employed the pens of the learned, in such a manner as to render all other objects and incidents almost matters of indifference. The modern Mennonites not only consider themselves as the descendants of the Waldenses, who were so grievously oppressed and persecuted by the despotic heads of the Romish Church, but pretend, moreover, to be the purest offspring of these respectable sufferers, being equally averse to all principles of rebellion, on the one hand, and all suggestions of fanaticism on the other.

"It may be observed, in the first place, that the Mennonites are not entirely in an error when they boast of their descent from the Waldenses, Petrobrusians, and other ancient sects, who are usually considered as witnesses of the truth, in the times of general darkness and superstition. Before the rise of Luther and Calvin there lay concealed, in almost all the countries of Europe, particularly in Bohemia, Moravia, Switzerland and Germany, many persons, who adhered tenaciously to the following doc-

trine, which the Waldenses, Wickliffites and Hussites had maintained, some in a more disguised, and others in a more open and public manner; viz.—'That the kingdom of Christ, or the visible church which he established upon earth, was an assembly of true and real saints, and ought therefore to be inaccessible to the wicked and unrighteous, and also exempt from all those institutions which human prudence suggests, to oppose the progress of iniquity, or to correct and reform transgressors.' This maxim is the true source of all the peculiarities that are to be found in the religious doctrine and discipline of the Mennonites; and it is most certain, that the greatest part of these peculiarities were approved by many of those who, before the dawn of the reformation, entertained the notion already mentioned, relating to the visible church of Christ. For it must be carefully observed that though all of these projectors of a new, unspotted, and perfect church were comprehended under the general denomination of Anabaptists, on account of their opposing the baptism of infants, and their rebaptizing such as had received that sacrament in a state of childhood in other churches, yet

they were, from their very origin, subdivided into various sects, which differed from each other in points of no small moment.

"It is true, that many Anabaptists suffered death, not on account of their being considered as rebellious subjects, but merely because they were judged to be incorrigible heretics; for in this century the error of limiting the administration of baptism to adult persons only, and the practice of rebaptizing such as had received that sacrament in a state of infancy, were looked upon as most flagitious and intolerable heresies" (Mosheim's *Church History,* Part II., chap. 3, pp. 490-493).

Writing of the suffering of the Anabaptists in Europe, Mrs. Hutchinson, one of the best writers of her time, says: "Many chose to leave their dearest relations to retire into any foreign soil where they might enjoy the free exercise of God's worship. Such as could not flee were tormented in the Bishop's Court, fined, whipped, imprisoned and suffered to enjoy no rest till the whole land was reduced to slavery. O pitying skies, is there nowhere beneath your

encircling dome, a land where this agony can cease, because the soul is free?"

Bishop Bossuet, the great Catholic controversialist, complaining of Calvin's party for claiming apostolical succession through the Waldenses, observes: "You adopt Henry and Peter Bruis among your predecessors, but both of them, everybody knows, were Anabaptists."

But in the Syro-Babylonian desert, off the line of the church's main advance, primitive forms of Christianity, perhaps also of Essenism, still survived which the course of church history had left untouched. To these belong, on the one hand, Sabians (Baptists); on the other, the numerous Anchorets" (p. 547, IX. Edition, *Ency. Brit.,* by Rev. F. W. Gotch, LL.D.).

According to this high and disinterested authority, Baptists can be traced to 618 A.D. The overwhelming presumption is that a denomination whose history extends to this remote date must seek its origin at the original source of the churches.

"Cardinal Hosius, President of the Council of Trent (A. D. 1545), a distinguished dignitary of the Church of Rome, says: 'If you behold their cheerfulness in

suffering persecution, the Anabaptists run before all the heretics. If you have regard to the number, it is likely that in multitude they would swarm above all others, if they were not grievously plagued, and cut off with the knife of persecution. If you have an eye to the outward appearance of godliness, both the Lutherans and the Zwinglians must grant that they far pass them. If you will be moved by the boasting of the word of God, these be no less bold than Calvin to preach, and their doctrine must stand invincible above all power, because it is not their word, but the word of the living God.' The testimony of these two writers covers the ground from the first Christian martyrdom to the reformation of the sixteenth century" (*The Baptist Denomination*, p. 262).

"It will there be shown that a succession of principles, like those held by the Baptist churches of to-day, may be easily traced from the twelfth century onward to our times. The tracing of these principles is a necessary and legitimate part of the history, for though Baptists are of late origin, they did not spring out of the ground and invent *de novo* the type of doctrine and

practice associated with their name. Their roots go back many centuries before their definite origin and formal organization" (Henry C. Vedder: *Story of the Churches*).

The Wickliffites.—"It is pretty clear," says Dr. Hurd, "from the writings of many learned men, that Dr. John Wickliffe, the first English reformer, either considered infant baptism as unlawful, or at least not necessary, and he denied that sin was taken away by baptism. Some of Wickliffe's followers maintained that the children of the believers are not to be sacramentally baptized" (*All Religions,* p. 718).

Hussites.—"A letter describing the sentiments of the Hussites, written from Bohemia to Erasmus, dated Oct. 10, 1519, states as follows: 'They renounce all the rites and ceremonies of our church; they ridicule our doctrine and practices in both sacraments; they deny orders (the hierarchy), and elect officers from among the laity; they receive no other rule than the Bible; they admit none into their communion till they be dipped in water, or baptized; and they reckon one another without distinction of rank to be called brothers and sisters.' If this, says Ivimey, was the case

with respect to the followers of Wickliffe in Bohemia, what should hinder us from believing that the followers of Wickliffe in England held similar sentiments respecting the discipline of the church of Christ, and that they also maintained that none ought to be admitted into their communion until they were dipped in water, or baptized?" (Coleman's *Collection of Letters to Men of Note,* as quoted by Ivimey, Vol. I., p. 70).

Barnard, Abbot of Clairval.—"The Albigenses and Waldenses administer baptism only to adults. They do not believe in infant baptism" (*Facts Opposed to Fiction,* p. 47).

"*Dr. Wall records* that the Leonists, or followers of Waldo, say that the washing given to children does no good. They condemn all the sacraments of the Catholic Church" (Jones' *Lectures,* Vol. II., p. 486).

Izam, the troubadour, a Dominican persecutor, says: "They admitted another baptism to what the church did—that is, believers' baptism" (*Rob. Eccl. Res.,* p. 463).

Mezeray says: "In baptism in the twelfth century, they plunged the candidate in the sacred fount, to show them what operation

that sacrament had on the soul" (*History of France,* twelfth cent., p. 288).

Father Gretzer, who edited Sacco's works in 1613, on the margin opposite the account of the Waldenses' way of teaching, has this striking comment: " 'This is a true practice of the heretics of our age, particularly of the Anabaptists.' There are few of the Baptists of the present day, it is to be hoped, who would blush to own an alliance with either the old Waldensian preachers, or the heretical Baptists referred to by this father of the Catholic Church, at least in this part of their conduct; and, indeed, it would be well if all our missionaries and private Christians of the present day were as conversant with the word of God as the Waldenses even in that dark age appear, from the testimony of their very enemies, to have been" (Jones' *Church History,* p. 352).

Limborch, Professor of Divinity in the University of Amsterdam, in 1670, who wrote a history of the Inquisition, in comparing the Waldenses with the Christians of his own times, says: "To speak honestly of what I think of all the modern sects of Christians, the Dutch Baptists more re-

semble both the Albigenses and Waldenses, but particularly the latter" (*Rob. Res.*, p. 311).

"One of the most recent and celebrated works in ecclesiastical history which has appeared on the continent of Europe is by M. De Potter, who in a compendious account of these people, the Waldenses, says: 'They called the pope antichrist, opposed the payment of tithes, abolished the distinctions in the priesthood, denied the authority of councils, rejected all the ceremonies of baptism except simple ablution, and laying stress on the truth, that in infancy there can be no actual conversion to the Christian faith, they therefore baptized anew all those who left the Romish Church wishing to embrace their doctrines. In a word, they rejected everything which they did not find enjoined in the gospel and the sacred Scriptures'" (De Potter, Vol. VI., p. 405).

"The pope himself declared that unless the sword of the faithful extirpated the Waldenses, their doctrine would soon corrupt all Europe" (Spanheim's *Eccl. Annals*, London, 1829, as quoted by Hague, p. 74).

"There is reason to think that in the

middle of the twelfth century congregations of Waldenses Baptists were gathered in Switzerland and France, under the name of Apostolici; for, in the year 1147, we find Bernard, abbot of Clairvaux, complaining against the earl of St. Gyles for favoring one of their noted teachers, named Henry, who is charged with 'hindering infants from the life of Christ, the grace of baptism being denied them'" (Mosheim, Cen. 12, Part II., chaps. 5, 8).

"Zwinglius, the celebrated Swiss Reformer, who was contemporary with Luther, Muncer, and Stork: 'Is Anabaptism a novelty? Did it spring up in a day? The institution of Anabaptism is no novelty, but for one thousand and three hundred years has caused great disturbance in the church, and has acquired such a strength that the attempt in this age to contend with it appeared futile for a time.' This carries our history back to A.D. 225" (*Introduction to Orchard's History*).

"Theodore Beza, the cotemporary and colleague of Calvin, in his 'Treatise of the Famous Pillars of Learning and Religion,' says: 'As for the Waldenses, I may be permitted to call them the very seed of the

primitive and purer Christian Church, since they are those that have been upheld, as is abundantly manifest, by the wonderful providence of God, so that neither those endless storms and tempests by which the whole Christian world has been shaken for so many succeeding ages, and the western parts at length so miserably oppressed by the Bishop of Rome, falsely so called; nor those horrible persecutions which have been expressly raised against them, were ever able so far to prevail as to make them bend, or yield a voluntary subjection to the Roman tyranny and idolatry" (*Preface to Morland's History,* p. 7; Jones' *Church History,* p. 353).

H. Bullinger invariably identifies the Donatists with the Anabaptists, or, as he styles them, "baptists." "They are," continues he, "similar in every particular to the old baptists."

Fuller's account of the Anabaptists in England, who came over from Holland, and their agreement with the Donatists, is thus expressed: "A match being now made up by the lord Cromwell's contrivance, betwixt king Henry and the lady Anne of Cleves, Dutchmen flocked faster than formerly into

England." After bestowing upon these newcomers a number of very opprobrious epithets, he says: "They were branded with the general name of Anabaptists. These Anabaptists," continues he, "for the main, are but Donatists new dipt."

The Paulicians.—"It is evident," says Mosheim, "they rejected the baptism of infants."

Dr. Peter Allix, a Frenchman, compelled by the revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1685) to take refuge in London, published there numerous works. Among them, "Some Remarks upon the Ecclesiastical History of the Ancient Churches of Piedmont, 1690," affirms "that they, with the Manicheans, were Anabaptists, or rejecters of infant baptism, and were consequently reproached with that term."

The Paterines.—As the Catholics of those times baptized by immersion, the Paterines, by what name soever they were called—as Manicheans, Gazari, Josephites, Passagines, etc.—made no complaint of the mode of baptizing, but when they were examined, they objected vehemently against the baptism of infants, and condemned it as an error; among other things they said

that a child knew nothing of the matter, that he had no desire to be baptized, and was incapable of making any confession of faith, and that the willingness of and professing of another could be of no service to him.

The Berangarians.—They admitted only adults to baptism. Bellarmine and Mezeray rank them among the Sacramentarians and Anabaptists. They flourished in the eleventh century.

The Petrobrusians.—They held that no persons whatever were to be baptized before they were come to the full use of their reason. This, according to Mosheim, was the first article of Peter's creed.

The Henricians.—"We have no account," says Mosheim, "of the doctrines of this reformer transmitted to our times. All we know of the matter is, that he rejected the baptism of infants," etc.

It is not, however, necessary to establish Baptist perpetuity by tracing their churches through the ages. A shorter, and, to our thinking, an equally satisfactory, way is to demonstrate their perpetuity by a process of elimination and cancellation. Assuming that the churches organized by Christ and the Apostles have had a continuous existence, it

will be sufficient if I can disprove the claims of all other denominations to an uninterrupted existence since the days of Christ and the Apostles. If it can be shown, with certainty, that all other denominations except the Baptists have originated far this side of apostolic times, then there can be but one claimant to apostolic origin and continuous existence. In other words, to disprove all others is to prove the claim of the Baptists.

In pursuing this plan it will be necessary to show the origin of all existing denominations, especially those which claim Scriptural origin and perpetuity. A little investigation will show that Christ had ascended, and all the Apostles had been buried for several centuries, before any of the denominations, save the Baptists, had been instituted.

First of all, it will be in order to ascertain the origin of the Roman Catholic hierarchy.

Origin of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy.

As is well known, the Roman Church predicates its claim to a Scriptural origin on the supposition that Peter was the first pope

of Rome. Unless they can prove that Peter was at Rome, and that he was also a pope, their claim to an apostolic origin is utterly false. However, there is no controversy on this point, as all the claims of the Roman hierarchy are conditioned upon the primacy of Peter. The two are inseparable and must rise or fall together. Hence, for the purposes of this discussion, it will only be necessary to prove that Peter was never a pope at Rome or anywhere else. It should be borne in mind that the burden of proof is upon Romanists to prove that Peter was in Rome and that he was a pope. This has never been done, and never can be done.

The overwhelming supposition is that Peter was never, at any time, in Rome. The Roman contention is that Peter came to Rome in A. D. 42, which was the second year of the reign of Claudius, and that he continued as pope for twenty-five years. There is not one scintilla of evidence offered, or that can be offered, to support this claim, while all the circumstances are strongly against it. In Paul's letter to the Romans he offers salutations to a number of his friends in Rome, though no mention whatever is made of Peter. Neither does Paul

in any way refer to the founding of the church by Peter. It is hardly conceivable that Paul would write a letter to the Roman Christians, and not refer to their bishop or his work in any way. The strong implication of Paul's letter is that no Apostle had yet visited Rome, as he states that he wished to impart some spiritual gift, to the end that they might be established. The very idea that Paul would say that he desired to establish a church whose pastor was a pope is simply and supremely preposterous, even if any such entity as pope was once named in the New Testament! We have five letters from Paul while at Rome, yet no one of them contains a word from Peter. In his last letter Paul complains that only Luke is left with him. Certainly if Peter was with him he would not have complained that only Luke was with him. The Scriptures mention several places where Peter visited, but they never mention that he was at any time in Rome.

Roman Catholics contend that he was forced to leave Rome on account of persecution. Of this there is no proof, but even if he had been driven away, it is strange that he never cared enough for his

people to write them so much as a letter.

Though it could be established that Peter was at Rome, and this must be established before Romanists can demonstrate their contention, it would still be necessary to prove that he was a pope. We have sometimes been at loss to understand why our Catholic friends ever selected Peter as a pope. It is a fact that he cursed, and denied Christ, though we can not assume that such acts constitute special qualifications for Papal supremacy. We boldly affirm that there is not a word in the entire New Testament that teaches, even by remote implication, that Peter was ever a pope. Certainly, if he was, he died without a knowledge of the fact. There is nothing in the New Testament to suggest that Peter ever thought that he was a pope, or that any one else ever thought so.

Until Catholics can prove their assumption that Peter was Pope of Rome, it will not be necessary to consider for a moment their preposterous claims. But even were it granted that Peter was at Rome and that he was a pope, the Roman Catholic hierarchy has by faith and practice forfeited its right to be called a Scriptural church.

As a matter of fact, there was never anything that would meet the definition of a pope until the beginning of the eighth century.

Origin of the Church of England, or Episcopal Church.

It is but simple truth to say that the incontrovertible verdict of history is that the Church of England (Episcopal) originated on account of the dislike of Henry VIII. for his queen (Catherine) and his fondness for Anne Boleyn, the mother of Queen Elizabeth. He naturally sought the good offices of Cardinal Wolsey to secure a divorce from Catherine. For six years Wolsey and the pope had trifled with him, and probably for purely selfish ends had thwarted his desires.

The pope, on account of the powerful Catholic connections of Catherine, finally refused to sanction the divorce. It was then that Henry assumed supremacy over the church. By proclamation he forbade all persons to purchase anything in Rome. As might have been expected, this raised a storm of protest by the clergy. By way of retaliation, the king caused an indictment to be preferred against them at Westminster

Hall, and obtained judgment against them under the statute of premunire. By this all of their property was forfeited to the Crown. They were allowed to retain their estates by paying large sums of money and "acknowledging the king as the sole head of the Church of England." Shortly afterwards, by convocation and Parliament, the king was confirmed in his claim as spiritual ruler of England.

The monks and friars had also to be dealt with. This was done in a summary way by the king appointing Lord Cromwell as Visitor-General. Many of these were turned into the king's hands. Many of their relics were exposed and destroyed. Among these, as quoted by Mr. Hall, were the following: "The coals that roasted St. Lawrence; one wing of the angel that brought over the head of the spear, that pierced the Saviour's side; the rood of grace, so contrived by springs and pulleys that the lips might move upon occasion." The dungeon and the fagot were freely used to suppress opposition to the policies of the king.

With the king's cause, Toustal, Bishop of London, gave orders to buy up all the copies of Tyndale's translation of the New

Testament. After their securing a great number, they were publicly burned at Cheapside. It should be borne in mind that the church of which Henry made himself the head was then to all intents and purposes the Roman Church. Penance and auricular confession were enjoined and observed.

"Henry the Eighth attempted to constitute an Anglican Church differing from the Roman Catholic Church on the point of the supremacy, and on that point alone. His success in this attempt was extraordinary. The force of his character, the singularly favourable situation in which he stood with respect to foreign affairs and the immense wealth which the spoliation of the abbeys placed at his disposal, and the support of that class which still halted between two opinions, enabled him to bid defiance to both the extreme parties, to burn as heretics those who avowed the tenets of the Reformers, and to hang as traitors those who owned the authority of the Pope" (Macaulay's *History of England,* Vol. I., p. 32).

But as the Government needed the support of the Protestants, so the Protestants needed the protection of the Government. Much was therefore given up on both sides

and union was effected; and the fruit of the union was the Church of England (Macaulay's *History of England,* Vol. I., p. 33).

To this day the constitution, the doctrines and the services of the church retain the visible marks of the compromise from which she sprang. She occupies a middle position between the churches of Rome and Geneva. Her doctrinal confessions and discourses, composed by Protestants, set forth principles of theology in which Calvin or Knox would have found scarcely a word to disapprove. Her prayers and thanksgivings, derived from the ancient breviaries, are very generally such that Cardinal Fisher or Cardinal Pole might have heartily joined in them. A controversialist who puts an Arminian sense on her articles and homilies will be pronounced by candid men to be as unreasonable as a controversialist who denies that the doctrine of baptismal regeneration can be discovered in her liturgy.

Nothing, however, so strongly distinguished the Church of England from other churches as the relation in which she stood to the monarchy. The king was her head. The limits of the authority which he possessed as such were not traced with preci-

sion. The laws which declared him supreme in ecclesiastical matters were drawn rudely and in general terms. If, for the purpose of ascertaining the sense of those laws, we examine the books and lives of those who founded the English Church, our perplexity will be increased. For the founders of the English Church wrote and acted in an age of violent intellectual fermentation, and of constant action and reaction. They therefore often contradicted each other, and themselves. That the king was, under Christ, sole head of the church was a doctrine which they all with one voice affirmed; but those words had very different conjectures (Macaulay).

As every motive, therefore, of inclination and policy seemed thus to concur in making the king desirous of a divorce from Catherine, and as his prospect of success was inviting, he resolved to make applications to Clement, and he sent Knight, his secretary, to Rome for that purpose (Hume).

The emperor, who had gotten intelligence of Henry's application to Rome, had exacted a promise from the pope to take no steps in the affair before he communicated them to the imperial ministers; and Clement, em-

barrassed by this promise, and still more overawed by the emperor's forces in Italy, seemed willing to postpone those concessions desired of him by Henry. Importuned, however, by the English ministers, he at last put into their hands a commission to Wolsey, as legate, in conjunction with the Archbishop of Canterbury, or any other English prelate, to examine the validity of the king's marriage, and of Julius' dispensation for the king's marriage with any other person; and promised to issue a decretal bull annulling the marriage with Catherine. But he represented to them the dangerous consequences which must ensue to him, if these concessions should become known; and he conjured them not to publish these papers, or make any further use of them, till his affairs were in such a condition as to secure his liberty and independence. And his secret advice was, whenever they should find the proper time for opening the scene, that they should prevent all opposition by proceeding immediately to a conclusion, by declaring the marriage with Catherine invalid, and by Henry's instantly espousing some other person. Nor would it be so difficult, he said, for himself to confirm these

proceedings after they were passed, as previously to render them valid by his consent and authority" (Hume, Vol. I., p. 67).

"That pope (Clement) had always passed for the son of Julian of Medicis, who was the sovereign family of Florence, and though Leo X., his kinsman, had declared him legitimate, upon a pretended promise of marriage between his father and mother, few believed that declaration to be founded on any just reason or authority. The canon law, indeed, had been entirely silent with regard to the promotion of bastards to the papal throne; but what was still dangerous, the people had entertained violent prepossession that this stain in birth of any person was incompatible with so holy an office" (Hume, p. 68).

"She told him that she was a stranger in his dominions, without protection, without counsel, without assistance, exposed to all injustice which her enemies were pleased to impose upon her; that she had quitted her native country, without other resource than her connections with him and his family, and had expected that, instead of suffering thence any violence or iniquity, she was assured in them of a safeguard against

every misfortune; that she had been his wife for twenty years, and would here appeal to himself whether her affectionate submission to his will had not merited better treatment than thus to be, after so long a time, thrown from him with so much indignity; that she was conscious . . . that he himself was assured . . . that her virgin honor was yet unstained when he received her into his bed, and that her connections with his brother had been carried no farther than the ceremony of marriage; that their parents, the kings of England and Spain, were esteemed the wisest princes of their time. But the most important law passed this session was that which regulated the succession to the crown: the marriage of the king with Catherine was declared unlawful, void and of no effect; the primate's sentence annulling it was ratified; the marriage of the queen was established and confirmed" (Hume, p. 98).

"The Parliament, being again assembled, conferred on the king the title of the only supreme head on earth of the Church of England, as they had already invested him with all the real power belonging to it" (Hume, p. 99).

"While Henry proceeded with so much order and tranquility in changing the national religion, and while his authority seemed secure in England, he was held in some inquietude by the state of affairs in Ireland and in Scotland" (Hume, p. 101).

"What the first of the Tudors had done for the political independence of the kingdom, the second was to do for its ecclesiastical independence. Henry the Seventh had freed England from the interference of France or the house of Burgundy, and in the question of divorce Cromwell saw the means of bringing Henry the Eighth to free it from the interference of the Papacy" (Green's *History of the English People*).

"Each of these acts was, no doubt, intended to tell on the pope's decision, for Henry still clung to the hope of extorting from Clement a favorable answer, and at the close of the year a fresh embassy, with Gardiner, now Bishop of Winchester, at its head, was dispatched to the Papal court" (Green, p. 196).

"The full import of the act of supremacy was only seen in the following year. At the opening of 1535 Henry formally took

the title of 'on earth supreme head of the Church of England' " (Green, p. 202).

"Step by step the ground had been cleared for the great statute by which the new charter of the English Church was defined in the session of 1534" (Green, p. 203).

Dr. Charles Hase, the great church historian, in writing under the head of "Establishment of the Anglican Church," says:

"But Henry defended the religion of St. Thomas with his pen and sword. Subsequently, however, his deadly love was fixed upon Anne Boleyn, and he entertained doubts of the lawfulness of his marriage with Catherine of Aragon, his brother's widow. Clement VII. could not consent to annul his marriage with the aunt of the emperor. By the advice of Cranmer the king obtained a decision of a body of learned men, who declared that the marriage of a brother's widow was null and void. He then married Anne and fell under the Papal ban" (Hase, p. 421).

I have given extended quotations in this connection owing to the denial by many Episcopal ministers that Henry VIII. was the founder of the Church of England. The

data on this subjcct are not always available, and inasmuch as the Episcopal Church is the only so-called Protestant church that claims Scriptural succession, it has been deemed not unwise to insert this historical evidence.

If any proposition in human history can be demonstrated beyond the peradventure of a doubt, it is the origin of the Church of England. We do not recall a single secular historian, who has written of the times of Henry VIII., who does not claim that Henry VIII. was an ardent member of the Roman Catholic Church, and that he left this church and started the Church of England because Pope Clement refused to grant him a divorce from his wife Catherine.

It follows, therefore, that a church started by a man in 1535, upon the passing of the Act of Supremacy, can not be in succession to the church instituted by Christ while on the earth, and concerning which he said that the gates of hell should not prevail against it.

Origin of the Lutheran Denomination.

"The rise of this church must be dated from that remarkable period when Pope Leo

X. drove Martin Luther, with his friends and followers, from the bosom of the Roman hierarchy, by a solemn and violent sentence of excommunication. It began to acquire a regular form, and a considerable degree of stability and consistence, from the year 1530, when the system of doctrine and morality which it had adopted was drawn up and presented to the Diet of Augsburg; and it was raised to the dignity of a lawful and complete hierarchy, totally independent of the laws and jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff, in consequence of the treaty concluded at Passau, in 1552, between Charles V. and Maurice, elector of Saxony, relating to the religious affairs of the empire" (Mosheim's *Church History,* Sect. 3, p. 503).

"The drawing up of the Augsburg Confession marks the culmination of the German Reformation (1530); and the life of Luther from henceforth possesses comparatively little interest. He survived sixteen years longer, but they are years marked by few incidents of importance. He died at Eisleben on the 18th of February, 1546, and was buried at Wittenberg" (*Chambers' Encyclopædia,* Vol. VI., p. 747).

Origin of the Presbyterian Denomination.

The Scottish offspring, congregation or kirk, began her military life at Presth, May, 1559, and was legally Christianized August 17, 1560, by the states, when the Pope was supplanted by the Headship of the Queen (Spotwood's *History,* B. III., pp. 121, 150).

"It used to be claimed that Presbyterianism survived in the ancient Celtic polity, which, though differing widely from diocesan Episcopacy, was very unlike Presbyterianism (Ireland, p. 210; Scotland, p. 242; Columba; Culdees). The Waldenses were perhaps anti-Episcopal. But Presbyterianism, as we know it, first asserted itself at or after the Reformation, when earnest attempts were everywhere made to restore to the church primitive doctrine and form. In Germany, France and the Continent, from the relationship of church and state, its free development was prevented. It was Calvin in Geneva who, though not the originator, gave Presbyterianism the form which, with modifications, it has ever since retained. It occupies a middle position between diocesan Episcopacy and Congrega-

tionalism, and may be styled ecclesiastical republicanism" (*Chambers' Encyclopædia,* Vol. III., p. 392).

"In 1541 he returned to Geneva at the public request of the inhabitants, and his system of ecclesiastical discipline, called the Consistory, was established in the city in the same year" (*Nelson's Encyclopedia,* Vol. II., p. 457).

"In this infant state of the reformed church, the only point that prevented its union with the followers of Luther was the doctrine they taught with respect to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper."

"In the year 1541, John Calvin, who surpassed almost all the doctors of this age in laborious application, constancy of mind, force of eloquence, and extent of genius, returned to Geneva, whence the opposition of his enemies had obliged him to retire. On his settlement in that city, the affairs of the new church were committed to his direction; and he acquired also a high degree of influence in the political administration of that republic. This event changed entirely the face of affairs, and gave a new aspect to the reformed church" (Mosheim, Sect. 3, p. 474).

"The church of Scotland acknowledges

as its founder, John Knox, the disciple of Calvin; and accordingly, from its first reformation, it adopted the doctrine, rites and form of ecclesiastical government established at Geneva. To these it has always adhered with the utmost uniformity, and has maintained them with the greatest jealousy and zeal; so that even in the last century the designs of those who attempted to introduce certain changes into its discipline and worship were publicly opposed by the force of arms" (Mosheim's *History,* p. 477).

"After many severe disturbances, however, the influence of Savoy was finally overthrown by means of an alliance with Berne, the Reformation was triumphantly successful, and Geneva became a member of the Swiss Confederation (1535). After the victory of the people of Berne in the Canton de Vaud, the Reformation triumphed there also, and subsequently to a religious conference at Lausanne (Oct., 1536) was formally introduced" (*History of the Christian Church,* by Hase, p. 400).

Origin of Congregational Societies.

Of all these sects the most famous was that which was formed, about the year

1581, by Robert Browne, an insinuating man, but very unsettled and inconsistent in his views and notions of things. This innovator did not greatly differ, in point of doctrine, either from the Church of England or from the rest of the Puritans; but he had formed singular notions concerning the nature of the church and the rules of ecclesiastical government. He was for dividing the whole body of the faithful into separate societies or congregations, not larger than those which were formed by the apostles in the infancy of Christianity; and maintained that such a number of persons as could be contained in an ordinary place of worship ought to be considered as a church, and enjoy all the rights and privileges that are competent to an ecclesiastical community.

He also maintained that the power of governing each congregation, and providing for its welfare, resided in the people; and that each member had an equal share in this direction, and an equal right to regulate affairs for the good of the whole society. Hence all points both of doctrine and discipline were submitted to the discussion of the whole congregation, and that which was supported by a majority became law.

Their founder returned into England, and, having renounced his principles of separation, took orders into the Established Church, and obtained a benefice. The Puritan exiles, whom he thus abandoned, disagreed among themselves, and split into parties; and their affairs declined from day to day. This engaged the wiser part of them to mitigate the severity of their founder's plan, and to soften the rigour of his uncharitable decisions; and hence arose the community of the Independents, or Congregational Brethren; a sect which still subsists, and of which an account shall be given in the history of the following century (Mosheim's *Church History,* Sec. 3, p. 480).

"American Congregationalism had its origin in England in the reign of Elizabeth. Many English Protestants felt that the Reformation as introduced under that great queen had gone far enough toward the realization of what they believed that the Bible taught that a Christian church should be. . . .

"The first to proclaim these Separatist views successfully was Rev. Robert Browne, a graduate of Cambridge University. In 1580 he formed a Congregational church in

Norwich. A similar church completed its organization at London in 1592, and another came into being at Scrooby, one hundred and fifty miles north of London, in 1605 or 1606" (*Bible Encyclopædia and Dictionary*).

"The Congregationalism of England and the United States has its roots in Puritanism. The first important name in the development is Robert Browne (1550-1633), a native of Rutlandshire. Considerable bodies arose in the eastern counties of England and in Wales, and a central association was formed in London. Persecution led several leaders to emigrate to Holland (1592). There they were tolerated, and flourished among English residents, but became divided among themselves. Some, under John Smyth, advanced to a Baptist position; others, of whom John Robinson was chief, held views practically identical with modern Congregationalism. From Holland both types of Independency were reimported into Britain" (*Nelson's Encyclopædia*).

Origin of the Methodist Societies.

The origin of what is now known as the Methodist Church is too well known and

generally admitted to require proof. In this connection, Prof. George Fisher, in his "History of the Christian Church," says:

"The principal originators of the great religious revival of which Methodism was the offspring were John Wesley and George Whitfield, but to the indomitable will and organizing genius joined with religious fervor of Wesley, its existence as a distinct and influential body is chiefly due. . . . He [Wesley] ordained Coke, and authorized him to ordain Asbury, as superintendents or bishops for the Methodists in America. . . . He was ultimately obliged to register his chapels in order to protect them, according to the provisions of the Act of Toleration. He gave them by a deed of trust into the charge of one hundred preachers. He thereby conferred on the Methodist body a separate legal status. Thus the instrumentalities which had at first been created as ancillary and supplemental to the Church of England resulted in giving being to a distinct and compact ecclesiastical body."

It is a fact that for many years what is now called the Methodist Church was known as the "Society of Methodists." In Canada they are still known as the "Society of

Methodists." Neither of the Wesleys claimed the right to start a church, and both died members of the Church of England.

Of the origin of Methodism, Nelson's "Encyclopædia" says:

"Methodism owes its origin to the brothers John and Charles Wesley. While at Oxford they formed a club for the purpose of acquiring regular habits of religious study and work; in Wesley's own words, 'they resolved to live by rule and method.' This earned for them the designation of Methodists."

Dr. Hase, in his "History of the Christian Church," says:

"The Methodists did not at first desire a separation from the Episcopal Church; but when they were persecuted in various ways in that church, they began to form a society embracing many congregations, subject to a rigid system of ecclesiastical discipline, and under the jurisdiction of superintendents and synods."

In writing of Methodism in his "Ecclesiastical History," Marsh says: "This sect may be traced to John Wesley."

The Methodist denomination, as a denomination, was instituted in 1739.

Origin of the Campbellite Denomination.

As this sect is of such recent origin, and this origin so well known, and generally admitted; and since but few, if any, of them claim apostolic parentage, it is hardly necessary to attempt to prove that they have utterly no claim to a divine origin and Scriptural perpetuity. Indeed, there are those now living, who were personally acquainted with the founder of this denomination.

In 1909 this people celebrated their first centennial, though this celebration was a chronological anachronism. Their origin as a denomination can not be placed earlier than 1825, and it was somewhat later than this when they became a separate and distinct people.

Thus we have seen that all the various denominations, with the exception of the Baptist, had their origin far this side of the days of Christ and the Apostles, and therefore could not have been organized by Christ and the Apostles while they were on the earth. That Christ did build a church, and promised perpetuity to his churches,

is the clear teaching of the Scriptures.

With the exception of the Roman Catholic and Episcopal Churches, no one of the denominations, apart from the Baptists, even lay claim to have been instituted by Christ and the Apostles. We have shown by irrefragable proof that the Church of England, or Episcopal Church, was started by Henry VIII. in the sixteenth century. By common consent of Baptists and Protestants, the Roman Catholic Church has no right, by antecedent, faith or practice, to be called a church of Christ. It appears, therefore, that if Christ did institute a church, and that his churches, according to his promise, should have perpetuity, their only hope for perpetuity must be anchored in Baptist churches. But few will claim that Christ has ever left himself without a witness. If by a process of cancellation others are excluded, then these must have been Baptist witnesses.

One of the unaccountable things to us in this connection is that some Baptists are loath to believe in their own perpetuity, in spite of the fact that many among the world's greatest scholars who were not Baptists have cheerfully conceded the truth of

the Baptist contention for church perpetuity. The foregoing quotations from eminent scholars will suffice to show that our claim has been admitted by many whose interest it was to deny it.

It is hardly to be supposed that such men, without impregnable proof, would have granted all that the most ardent Baptist has ever claimed for our Scriptural origin and unbroken perpetuity.

Without doubt Baptists have dwarfed their plea and hindered their progress by not stressing the fact of their perpetuity. If not for our own sake, then for the Master's, we should demonstrate that his prophecy has not failed.

On the eve of the battle of the Pyramids, when the destiny of the French army trembled in the balances, Napoleon, pointing up to these imperial monuments of the ages, said, "From yonder heights, forty centuries look down upon you." Well may it be said of the Baptists of the universe, "Two thousand years of struggle and achievement are yours." And what a history they have had! Their martyr-roll glorifies alike their dead and living. From the Roman arena; from the Catacombs; from the Inquisition

and the Bastile; from the Piedmont valleys; from the snows of the everlasting Alps—they have come, conquering and to conquer. The historian who would trace their tracks across the centuries will find them bestrewed with tears and sprinkled with blood. They glory in their graves, as they do in the truth for which those graves were made.

Many who are satisfied with the Baptist past and present are anxiously asking, "What of the future?" And it must be admitted that there are tendencies now manifest among us that constitute this a pertinent and timely question. With the constant cry for a closer co-operation and amalgamation with other denominations, we may well take heed to our ways, and have a care for the faith once for all delivered to the saints. As never before, it behooves us to watch as well as pray. There are enemies without and within who eagerly await their opportunity to compass our denominational destruction. The storm of liberalism sweeps over us with a force unparalleled in all history, and only the elect of the Lord will withstand its fury. The smile of sarcasm and the finger of scorn are aimed at those who, in the fear of God and love of the

truth, yet dare to stand by the old landmarks. Baptists have too long contended for the faith to listen to the siren voice that would tempt us to surrender our mission or ministry. To the real Baptist the idea of compromising his faith is more abhorrent than the proposition to compromise his own honor. Dearer to him than his own life is the faith committed to his keeping. Baptists believe the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth; therefore they have nothing to compromise or surrender.

With all their hearts Baptists believe that the God of their past and present will be the God of their future. The God who has been their dwelling-place in the generations that are gone, will be their God in all the years that are to come. "The past is safe, we can look back and see it; the present is safe, we can look around and see it; and the future is safe, for

> "Behind the dim unknown
> Standeth God in the shadows,
> Keeping watch above his own."

A Resume.

We have seen that, according to his good purposes in grace, God has permitted Bap-

tists to be the guardians of the precious principle of soul liberty, which vouchsafes to every creature the inherent and inalienable right to worship God according to the dictates of the individual conscience. Without this God-given privilege, the world to-day would be manacled with the chains of ecclesiastical tyranny, and groaning under the awful burdens of the spiritual despot.

Every advance in the science of self-government, or of the progress of real religion in the human heart, has been predicated upon the principle of freedom of conscience as taught and practiced by Baptists. The religious liberty which is vouchsafed to the worshiper, at whatever shrine, is the gracious gift of the Baptist brotherhood, living and dead. When the church bells, on each recurring Sabbath, shall call to worship the Christians of our continent, they can well afford to thank God and breathe a blessing upon Baptists for the privilege of unmolested worship.

It is cause for gratitude and congratulation that the principle of religious liberty has so permeated the thinking of the world that countless millions would swim through seas of blood before they would surrender this heritage, bequeathed to them by the toils and

tears of our people. Nor can we guard too zealously this sacred principle, and here, as elsewhere, we shall find that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

We have further noted that Baptists have maintained through the ages the New Testament idea of a church. This presupposes the time-honored Baptist contention of a regenerate membership. This automatically excludes infant baptism, and religion by proxy or performance. Baptists have contended, and will contend, that a church should consist of baptized believers only. This forbids the idea of baptismal regeneration, and the sacerdotal character of the preacher, and the sacramental nature of the church. So far as our information extends, there is not another denomination now in existence that preaches and practices, to its logical limit, that a church of Christ is a body of baptized believers.

We have further seen that the present great missionary enterprises owe their origin to Baptist initiative. Baptists have blazed the pathway for others to follow to foreign fields. We surely should thank God that, in the fullness of time, he chose a Baptist to restore the Commission to its proper place

in the divine economy. Well may we ask, "What does God expect of us in view of all his goodness to us, and the high honors that he has conferred upon our people?"

It also appears that modern Bible schools were instituted by Baptists, and that hence the millions now in Bible schools are emphasizing the wisdom of Baptists in beginning this work. As we excel in priority, let us also strive to excel in achievement.

It is also in evidence that Baptists have preserved the democracy of New Testament churches. They have contended through the centuries for the equality of believers and the sovereignty of the churches. They believe that the church is of the redeemed, for the redeemed and by the redeemed.

The attempt, too, has been made to show that Baptists have wrought a noble work in Bible translation and circulation. They have long contended for an open Bible and a free conscience, and will never content themselves until these shall be the part and portion of every man, woman and child.

Baptists have proven to the world, through the continued existence of their churches and principles, that the promise of Christ to preserve his churches has never

failed. Truly they have demonstrated the truth of prophecy, and shown that the promises are sure and steadfast. Through the ages they have witnessed for Him, who has never left himself without a witness. Are we not justified in believing that He who has preserved us unto himself a peculiar people, and guided us all along the way, will keep us till the day dawn and the shadows flee away? We know not what may come in the future, but this we know, that whatever comes, Christ will come with it, and therefore all will be well.

The Last Baptist Battle.

While Baptists have been engaged in an age-long conflict, their warfare is not yet ended. The last great battle is yet to be fought and won. This battle is destined to be between the Roman Catholics and the Baptists; the armies of Rome and the serried hosts of righteousness. That this will be the final alignment there can be no doubt in the minds of those who are acquainted with the religious history of the past and the ecclesiastical situation of the present. It is a fact that every denomination which has ever existed, emanated directly or indirectly

from either the Baptists or the Roman Catholics. Even the Papacy is the illegitimate child of an apostate Baptist Church. We make bold to say that every denomination now in existence can be traced to Baptist or Roman Catholic parentage; indeed, Romanists have frankly confessed that Baptists have been their ancient and unconquered foe. And some of them have declared that all other denominations, save the Baptists, would return to their fold. Be this as it may, it will be generally admitted that Baptists and Romanists occupy the two extremes in ecclesiastical affairs. Between these two, as we see it, there can be no permanent abiding-place. When these two great armies are marshaled for the final conflict, all mediating bodies will be subjected to a deadly cross-fire that will necessitate their annihilation. Christ or antichrist is the essential logic of the situation. The forces are already taking their places in the line of battle—some under the banner of the dragon, dripping with the blood of the saints; others under the flag of our King, crimsoned with the blood of the Son of God. We can not shrink from the conflict if we would; and we would not if we could. Trying and tragic may be the

Armageddon, but the Lord of hosts is with us, the God of Jacob is our refuge. Let us, then, unterrified, stand for triumphant truth; and when the smoke of battle has cleared, God and the holy angels, and the spirits of just men made perfect, and redeemed men and women, will say "Hail!" to the friends of the faith, who have counted their lives not dear unto themselves, that they might contend for the faith once for all delivered to the saints. Amen! and amen! for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth forever and forever.

THE END.

Y0-BNY-036